The Christian East

OUR FRONTISPIECE.

OUR frontispiece is a photograph of the late Tsar Nicholas II. returning to his carriage after visiting the Iversky Shrine.

A striking instance both of Bolshevik anti-religious frightfulness and of Bolshevik vandalism is to be found in the recent destruction of this beautiful little building which stood by the gate of the Red Square outside the Kremlin at Moscow.

Iveria is the old Greco-Russian name for Georgia and the Shrine had its name because it housed an extremely ancient ikon, reputed to have been the work of St. Luke, which was once the peculiar treasure of the Georgian Nation and was brought to Russia for the Georgian Monastery at Mt. Athos in 1648.

The Iversky Shrine to which the Iversky ikon was brought with great ceremony by the Tsar Alexis and the Patriarch Nikon in 1669 and which was reconstructed by Alexander I. in 1791, was dear for its associations to the whole Russian Nation. Devout or otherwise, no Russian from the Tsar to the peasant would pass it without saluting it as we salute the Whitehall Cenotaph. Many recent visitors to Moscow have noted how though the Soviet had placed near it the inscription, Religion is the opiate of the people, that practice had continued to be observed even by soldiers of the Red Army.

THE PATRIARCH DMITRI.

IN the person of the aged Patriarch of Serbia, another of the great figures who witnessed and helped to guide the transition from Old Serbia to Yugo-Slavia has passed away. Through all the distresses, perplexities and triumphs which accompanied that change, he retained his place in the affections of his people, and died as he had lived, one of the most popular men in Serbia. And if they loved him, he on his side never lost touch and sympathy with the labouring peasantry from whom he was himself sprung. In the course of his ministerial life of sixty years he was Bishop of Skoplye and from 1905 Archbishop of Belgrad. It was, therefore, during his occupancy of the archiepiscopal throne of Belgrad that the Serbian Theological Students were sent to England and trained at Oxford. He himself visited this country in 1919. The political amalgamation which formed the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, was followed in 1922 by a corresponding achievement of ecclesiastical unity, and Archbishop Dmitri became Patriarch of the restored Serbian Patriarchate. The late Patriarch regarded the Anglican Church with real friendship, and the many Anglicans who knew him will learn of his death with deep regret.—R.I.P.

THE RÔLE OF THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE IN HISTORY.

By THE MOST REVEREND THE METROPOLITAN OF THYATIRA.

MOST of the present-day works on Byzantium, its history, its art, its philology, and in general, its civilization successfully refute the disparaging view of Byzantium and the Byzantines so long held in the West. They emphasize the importance of a State, which was, for a whole millennium, the champion of Christian civilization in the East, and the West's first line of defence against the inroads of Asiatic barbarism.

But while this is true as regards the Byzantine State, it cannot, as yet, be maintained that full justice has been done to the rôle played by the Orthodox Church as a civilizing agent in the Byzantine State itself, and as a force which ever radiated the light of the Christian Faith. There are exceptions, exceptions worthy of the highest praise—and, in this connection, I wish especially to mention the recent works of Professor Baynes and Mr. Robert Byron—the unbiassed researches of some historians are now beginning to assess at its true value the unbroken link of collaboration between the Byzantine State and the Church of Constantinople and especially the latter's missionary task. There are many reasons which have contributed to the overlooking of this fact. First, the bitterness which, since the Schism, has prevailed between East and West, and the contempt for the Eastern Church, and especially its head, the Patriarch of Constantinople, since the Patriarchate was the chief opponent of Rome's tendencies towards Re-union, or, more strictly, absorption. Secondly, the ignorance of Eastern Orthodox affairs manifested, especially by Continental Protestantism, which, while turning its attention to the investigation of the beginnings of Christianity, to which it wished to link the Reformation, neglected to study the essential nature of the Orthodox Church, regarding it as a withered branch of Christianity, bereft of life and power. To this erroneous conception of the Orthodox Church, there was another contributory factor. Whereas the Roman Church, the Anglican, and Protestantism show rivalry in their endeavours to gain for Christ the peoples of the earth, by the organization and continued support of missionaries in all parts of the world, the Orthodox East can now show no similar activity. For this reason it is wrongly concluded that the Orthodox Church in principle does not approve of the missionary movement. On the one hand, the dire circumstances in which it finds itself are not taken into account, nor, on the other, are the services it rendered in the past to the Christianization of the world. But, besides the missionary work of the Orthodox Church, and, especially, the Church of Constantinople, we do not consider that

sufficient praise has been given for the struggle, as honourable as it was arduous, which the Patriarchate of Constantinople maintained in keeping intact the Christianity of the peoples who suffered the cataclysm of the Asiatic invasion. National antipathies among the Balkan races which regained their freedom from the earlier half of the past century have often been instrumental in arming hand and pen against that Church, which, like a Mother, watched over and cared for them in the most critical hours of their history, and this prejudice was supported by many people in the West. It has become necessary to remove the obscurity that envelops the activities of the Church of Constantinople during the period after the Capture.

We must pass beyond the region of human omissions and human imperfections which beset every organization, in order to perceive the glory of the Orthodox Church, which, by its steadfastness and untiring energy preserved the Christian faith and Christian civilization of the nations beneath its sway, and led them to the fulfilment of their historic destinies. It is to these two spheres of activity in the Church of Constantinople that I wish to direct attention. First, however, I should like to say a few words about the evolution and development of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the principal agent of Christianity and civilization in the East.

A.—The Development of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The Orthodox Church, while steadfastly believing that the three orders, of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon, derive their origin from Our Lord and the Apostles, that is, that they exist by Divine Ordinance, holds that the administrative system of the Church is a product of historical evolution, that is, that it exists by ecclesiastical Law. As is well known from early times, a certain supremacy of the Bishops of capitals of Provinces over the other Bishops of the See was recognized, the former being also called Primi or Metropolitans. Again, among these, with the lapse of time, the Bishops of important centres acquired a pre-eminent position, such being Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, especially from the time when Constantine the Great divided the Roman Empire into divisions, and these divisions into Provinces and Departments. These Archbishops, called Exarchs or Primi, were the first to have the authority to ratify the election of, and to consecrate the Metropolitans of the Provinces, and to preside at their Synods. The rights of these Exarchs were confirmed by the 1st Œcumenical Synod in its 6th Canon ; the same Synod elevated especially the Exarchs of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch. Following in the footsteps of the 1st Synod, the 2nd Œcumenical Synod, in its 3rd Canon, promoted the Bishop of Byzantium, who till then was subject to the Exarch of Heráclea, to be an Exarch, and granted him the priority of honour after the Bishop of Rome in that Constantinople is " New Rome." The rights of the

Exarchs were thus consecrated, and ecclesiastical custom began to grant them the titles of Patriarch in the East, and " Pope " in the West, although the Patriarch of Alexandria was called, as he is still called," Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria." But the position of the Patriarch of Constantinople as Bishop of the new capital of the Empire did not merely release him from subservience to the Exarch of Heráclea, but also gradually contributed to the extension of his authority over the neighbouring dioceses of Pontus, Asia and Thrace. This extension advanced so rapidly that the 4th Synod, of Chalcédon, confirming his Episcopal Honours as equal to those of Rome, subjected to the Throne of New Rome the aforementioned Dioceses, as also the Bishops of barbarian countries, and granted him judicial authority over their Metropolitans. Thus, at the end of the sixth century the Throne of Constantinople included the Province of Pontus with 13 Metropolies and 67 Bishops, the Province of Asia with 13 Metropolies and 262 Bishops, the Province of Thrace with 5 Metropolies and 36 Bishops, and the barbarian lands of the Alani, the Goths, the Colchi and the Avazgi with their Bishops.

What was the relation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to the Patriarchates of the East, and the only Patriarchate of the West, Rome ? The interval of 200 years between the first recognition of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and the 4th Œcumenical Synod, consolidated the position of the Patriarch of Constantinople as the first Patriarch of the East. The remaining Eastern Patriarchates lost their former power and authority very early because extensive portions of their dioceses were lost to them through theological dissensions. They saw their power still further diminished from the time when the countries over which their authority extended came under the sway of the Arabs. But in spite of this internal supremacy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the polity of the Orthodox Church remained constitutional ; the Patriarch of Constantinople was considered merely *primus inter pares*, in contradistinction to the tendency of the Popes of Rome to concentrate into their hands supremacy over the whole Church. The Pope of Rome, both in previous periods, and especially from the time of the 4th Œcumenical Synod at every opportunity, by word and deed, claimed not merely a supremacy in dignity, " priority of honour," but also administrative and judicial authority over all the Bishops, not even, of course, excepting Constantinople. It was, therefore, inevitable that he should meet with opposition to his claims, from the Patriarch of Constantinople. The latter, relying on the decisions of the 2nd, and, especially, of the 4th Œcumenical Synod, insisted on his title to equality in rank and honour with the Bishops of Old Rome, holding that the latter had not jurisdiction over the whole Church, merely having a titular position and entitled to priority of honour. This title of " Œcumenical " which Justinian had, in 587, accorded to

John Nisteftes, and which Rome opposed with such insistence, with its *servus servorum dei*, signifies, as is well known, nothing else than that the Bishop of New Rome, as the capital of the "*Oikoumene*," is also "Œcumenical" Bishop. But besides this dissension as to the significance of the primacy, the East and the West were divided as to its source and origin. While, that is, according to the commonly prevailing principles in the East, the authority and order in rank of the Bishops are fixed by the position and political greatness of the various cities, and it frequently happens that when a city increases in political importance, its ecclesiastical importance increases simultaneously, *e.g.*, from an Episcopate to a Metropoly, in Rome the idea was prevalent that only the apostolic origin of a Church can bestow on it supremacy over the others. The position occupied by the Pope of Rome in Christendom was, of course, for many reasons exceptional. Not only was Rome the capital of the Roman Empire during the first centuries A.D., but also its Bishops were at a great advantage in comparison with those of Constantinople. For whereas, on account of his close relations with the Byzantine Court, the Patriarch of Constantinople was sometimes a prey to, and the instrument of, its arbitrary methods, the Bishop of Rome, by reason of the geographical distance, rarely came under its influence, especially after the secession of the Western Empire, and its subsequent dissolution. Whereas the East was disturbed by various heresies, in the West under the leadership of Rome, complete unity of faith prevailed. For this reason, those who were at strife with the East, turned towards Rome asking it to decide in their favour, and those who were pursued by the East fled to Rome's protection. And, as was inevitable, those who looked to Rome for redemption, vied with one another in extolling the apostolic nature and authority of Rome's Bishops, and fortuitously encouraged the tendencies of the Popes to Monarchy in the Church. Finally, whereas in the East, more than one Church could boast of its apostolic origin, in the West, Rome was the only Apostolic Church, its origin, indeed, being traced back to the chief apostles, Peter and Paul. And since the Bishop of Rome is the successor of Peter, it is obvious that the Pope of Rome is the head of the Bishops and the whole Church!

From the moment when the Exarch of Rome extended his primacy as a primacy of jurisdiction over the whole of the West, and claimed the power of imposing this jurisdiction over the East also, the clash between Rome and Constantinople was inevitable. Already the differing spiritual evolution of the two great sections of Christianity, the result of their geographical separation, was bringing about their gradual alienation, which was aided also by the difference of language. This opposition of the Church of Rome to that of Constantinople, which arose from the above causes, manifested itself for many centuries, and became especially bitter in the ninth century. The

struggle between Pope Nicholas and the Patriarch Photius, in spite of dogmatic differences and idiosyncrasies, utilized as arguments, was chiefly a contest centering round this question: Whether the all-embracing monocracy of the Popes in the West was to prevail in the East also, or whether the two Churches should, distinct and divided from one another, follow separate courses in the fulfilment of their mission in the world. And this contest was decided in favour of the second alternative, in the ninth century already, although the interruption of all inter-communion of the two Churches was not complete till 1054 A.D., when the relative excommunications were made by both sides. The resultant division still further showed the Patriarchate of Constantinople as the main ecclesiastical centre in the East. But before this, even, the Church of Constantinople had proved itself the power which not only brought to Christ the barbarian peoples living inside the Byzantine Empire, but spread the Christian faith among the hordes which surrounded the Byzantine State on East, North and West, and helped them to take their place among the community of civilized nations. How this was brought about will be seen by a brief review of the missionary work of the Church of Constantinople.

B.—The Missionary Work of the Church of Constantinople.

1. *Within the Byzantine Empire.* Whoever studies the ethnological composition of the Eastern Empire after its secession from the Western, cannot but admit that, in spite of the wide prevalence of the Christian Faith in it, there was need for missionary work. The effacing of the last traces of idolatry on the one hand, and the proselytizing of the barbarians recently settled in its Western provinces on the other, constituted the main concern of the Church of Constantinople. The Slav incursions not only disturbed the other phases of internal life of that section of the Byzantine Empire, but also upset the existing ecclesiastical organization and order to such a degree that for two centuries the Church in those parts was fighting for its existence and in doing so showed an unparalleled strength and activity. The Church of Constantinople, notwithstanding the wounds it received from these incursions, was able, by a long and laborious endeavour, not only to re-establish that section ecclesiastically on the basis of the Episcopates then remaining, but also to undertake missionary work and spread the Christian faith among the newcomers with an unshakable zeal. Although we cannot follow, step by step, the historical processes of this work; yet we know that among the measures taken were the consolidation of the remaining Episcopates, which, with the surviving local populations, formed hopeful oases in those parts. The foreign names of the Episcopates which we meet with in the still surviving "Catalogues of Episcopates" demonstrate the intelligence and broadness of outlook

which the Church of Constantinople showed in the work undertaken, and in overcoming the crisis that had arisen. Wherever the existing Episcopates were not numerous enough for the religious needs of the Christianized peoples, new ones were established, which, be it noted, were quite free from national prejudices or preconceptions. And while it is obvious that, by these new establishments, the jurisdiction of the old existing ones was circumscribed, the holders of these made no protests nor opposition, but obediently accepted whatever contributed to the promotion of the interests of the whole flock and the fulfilment of the Church's purpose on earth. Therefore, it is in no way paradoxical that the Slavs of the Byzantine Empire, enjoying full religious and linguistic freedom, had no desire to exchange the Byzantine yoke for any other, even that of a kindred race. "All that the Byzantine Empire and the Church of Constantinople did," says a modern historian, "to bring these barbarians to Christ, and to give them civilization, constitutes one of the most beautiful chapters of its history."

2. *Outside the Byzantine Empire.* But, much more important than the successes which attended the missionary efforts of the Church of Constantinople within the boundaries of the Empire, were its successes beyond these. To the East, Armenia, although it originally received Christianity from Cæsarea in Cappadocia through Gregory Photistis, owing to its proximity to the Byzantine Empire necessarily came under the spiritual influence of the Church of Constantinople. How profitable was this influence, is shown by the great ecclesiastical position, paralleled by its rich literary production, which it maintained from the fourth to the seventh century. Its lapse into Monophysitism, however much it curtailed the intercommunion of the two Churches, never removed the deep sentiment of kinship and sympathy between them. The wars attempted against the Persians in the times of the Byzantine Emperors, which resulted in the liberation of the Armenians, are admitted to be due to the recommendations of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, who were eager to preserve Christianity in that country. And just as it was from Constantinople that the apostle of India and Southern Arabia, Theophilus, started, so to Constantinople is due the Christianization of the Huns and Goths towards the North by Ulfilas, who set out from Cappadocia, but was ordained Bishop in Constantinople. Learning their language, and translating into it the Holy Gospel, he was able to christianize all the Goths beyond the Ister. Their lapse into Arianism was the occasion for St. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople, to make every effort to bring them back to the fold by means of preachers, chosen from the Goths themselves, and trained by himself. To the Goths he himself often preached through interpreters. And, although for long they remained faithful to Arianism and even attracted to it other peoples of the West, yet to the

liberal spirit of the Church of Constantinople are due the establishment of an independent Gothic language, to meet the religious needs of the novices, and the other gifts of Christian civilization, which, when they themselves had received them, they passed on to the peoples of the West.

On a scale similar to these activities was the later Christianization of the Chazari, who were settled in the South of modern Russia between the Volga and the Sea of Azov, and of the barbarian peoples around the Euxine. Three different civilizations represented by three religions, Islam, Judaism and Christianity, were there vying with one another for supremacy. The Hassan of the Chazari, who was on friendly terms with Byzantium, sent, in 861, a mission to request that someone capable of expounding the Christian Faith and defending it against the Jews and Saracens, should come to them as envoy. Such a one, on the recommendation of the Patriarch Photius, was chosen, the philosopher of Salonica, Constantine, who had formerly distinguished himself in a like mission to the Arabs, and who combined in his person great theological culture with a singular power of philosophical dialectic. Accompanied by his brother, Methodius, and a numerous following, he learnt the language of the Chazari in Cherson, the neighbouring Byzantine town, before arriving in the country of the Chazari. There he championed the Christian Faith at the appointed conference with such acuteness and such persuasiveness that the leader of the Chazari granted permission to all those of his subjects who wished to be baptized, and in a letter to the Emperor which the philosopher Constantine brought back with him on his return, he expressed the desire to be baptized himself. After the auspicious event of this mission the work of further Christianizing the Chazari was entrusted to the Bishop of Cherson by the Church of Constantinople.

This Christianization, however (which acquired importance on account of the influence which this people exercised on the Slav populations around, when it had helped to shake off the yoke of the Avars) forms one part only of a great scheme for bringing back to Christ all the barbarian peoples living round the Euxine. The Patriarch Photius, to whom belongs the honour of initiating this scheme, sent envoys to many of the districts bordering on the Euxine, and was successful in spreading the Christian Faith. Thus, in a letter to Bishop Antonius, of Sarmatia, he points out that the former " Inhospitable See " had, by the dissemination of the Gospel, become hospitable and pious ; while at the great Synod of Constantinople of 879, there were present two Bishops from the Euxine, Luke, Bishop of the Bosphorus, and Paul, Bishop of Cherson. The pupil of Photius, Nicholas the Mystic, on becoming Patriarch, continued the policy of his master, and undertook to restore to Christ

the neighbouring races of the Chazari, the Avazgi and Alani. Certainly, the return of the mass of the Russian people came later. But already, at that period, the Patriarch Photius, writing to the Patriarchs of the East, recalls with pleasure the fact which he considered his greatest success, that those of the Russians who had been christianized, sought and received their Bishop from Constantinople.

From the proximate North, the attention of Constantinople was soon turned to the North-West, to Moravia. There the first seeds of Christianity had been sown by Germany, at the time when Moravia was under the dominion of Charlemagne, as is witnessed by the existence there of communities belonging to the Bishoprics of Salzburg and Passau. But, in the main, the Christianization of the Moravians is due to the endeavours of Constantinople.

In 862 a delegation was sent by the chief of the Moravians, Ratislav, to Constantinople to ask for missionaries who would have a knowledge of the people's language.

What was the reason for this preference? In the first place, Byzantium, at that time, was to the eyes of the still barbaric West, a great representative of Christian civilization and faith.

Next, Ratislav, after organizing the political machinery of his country, wished to organize it ecclesiastically also, with the aid of a Bishop knowing the language and thus able to catechize the people. Finally, by this move, perhaps, he sought to free his country from the political intrigues to which the missionaries from Germany, coming at the head of legions, resorted.

The choice again fell on the two brothers from Salonica, who, knowing the Slav language (for they had invented its alphabet and already translated into it some evangelical lessons) had experience of missionary work from their previous missions. Intelligent, energetic, initiated not only in the language but also in the mentality of the people among whom they worked, it was not long before they overcame the opposition of the clergy, Latins and Franks, who surrounded Ratislav, already a Christian. This opposition was directed first of all towards the Slavonic language, into which the new missionaries translated the Holy Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical writings. The anonymous biographer of Constantine picturesquely describes his struggle. " He strove with them like David with the Gentiles. He overcame them with the words of Holy Writ, calling the champions of the three languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin, in which alone, according to their convention, God should be praised, disciples of Pilate, since Pilate ordered the inscription on the Cross to be in those three languages." But the opposition was directed also towards not only the language, but also its content, since the missionaries of the Slav, while following the Latin form of Liturgy, to which the Moravians were used, translated the Prayer Book and

the other Ecclesiastical Books from the Greek originals. It would take too long to dwell upon further details of this mission (the brothers' journey to Rome for the discussions that took place there about the language of the Liturgy, upon their victory, and upon the recognition, after Constantine's death, of Methodius as Archbishop, not only of Moravia but also of Pannonia which likewise was christianized by them). What interests us is this, that in the same way as the Moravians, the Pannonians, the Bohemians, the Hungarians and the Poles, received the light of the Gospel from Constantinople and from missionaries sent from there. But the subsequent German domination, and the inroad of Rome into these countries, effaced every trace of Eastern worship and Slavonic liturgical language.

But more immediate still was the interest of the Church of Constantinople in the christianization of the Bulgars, their close neighbours. Having settled down in Mysia and Thrace, and mingled with the Slavs, already established there, they formed a strong kingdom. Undoubtedly, the first seeds of Christianity were sown among them by the prisoners they brought from Byzantium, among whom were numbered Bishops and Priests. But the systematic christianization of the Bulgars dates from 863, when their leader Boris, defeated by the Byzantine armies, and judging that the christianization of his people was necessary, applied to Constantinople for missionaries. The Patriarch Photius sent these immediately, and soon after Bulgaria, following the example of its leader, received the Christian faith.

But, while Boris easily quelled a revolt of the party which inclined to idolatry, at the same time he turned towards Rome, wishing to rid himself of Byzantine influence. This move, which had the result of making even more tense the relations between Rome and Constantinople, was brought to nothing the moment Boris, deluded in his expectations from Rome, turned again to Constantinople. It is easily intelligible that this orientation of the Church in Bulgaria towards Constantinople was final. The charm of the Byzantine Liturgy, the magnificence of its ecclesiastical ceremonies, the beauty of the wonderful Byzantine Churches exercised such an influence over the novices that the Bulgars could not bring themselves to break away.

But, besides this, all Bulgaria came under the radiation of Byzantine civilization. Byzantium sent to Bulgaria not only Bishops and Priests but also teachers and artists and architects, and in Byzantium many of the young Bulgarians completed their studies.

From the time especially when the pupils of Methodius, expelled from Moravia after his death, entered Bulgaria by way of Constantinople, and introduced the Slavonic translation of Holy Writ, the Divine Liturgy and the other ecclesiastical books, the Bulgarian

Church continued to be a spiritual offspring of the Church of Constantinople, even after acquiring its independence.

And not this alone, but also, as Dr. Dvornik says, " Bulgaria, Slav in language and Byzantine in spirit was to serve in the dissemination of the Byzantine spirit among the other Slavs, the Serbs and the Russians."

Above all the preceding endeavours of the Church of Constantinople, is the christianization of the Russians. However early the seeds of Christianity had been sown in Southern Russia (for Leo the Wise calls Russia the diocese of the Throne of Constantinople), the christianization of the mass of the Russian people took place under Vladimir in 987. Vladimir had heard of Christianity from his grandmother Olga, who was baptized in Constantinople. While, however, he was wavering between the different religions which sought to proselytize him, he sent ten Boyars who, after visiting various religious centres, came to Constantinople. Entering the Cathedral of Saint Sophia at the moment when the Patriarch was celebrating the Divine Liturgy in the presence of the Emperor, they were so amazed by the beauty of the Holy Service that on returning home they persuaded Vladimir to accept his religion from Constantinople.

Innumerable clergy from Constantinople, accompanying the sister of the Emperor, Anna, consort of Vladimir, baptized the multitude in the streams of the River Boristhenes, after Vladimir had himself set the example.

From Kiev (which is justly regarded as the Jerusalem of Russia), Christianity was rapidly spread throughout Russia. Churches and schools were established everywhere on the pattern of their Byzantine counterparts ; and the Slavonic translation of the Holy Gospel, Divine Liturgy and Ecclesiastical Books formed the basis not only of the ecclesiastical but also of the national culture of the Russians. In their conversion the Church of Constantinople performed its greatest achievement ; it bestowed on a new people the treasures of its religious spirit and life, and thus facilitated the further spread of Christianity among many other peoples in the East.

For many centuries after this the Church of Constantinople continued to guide the newly-formed Church through the medium of the Metropolitans of Kiev, who were sent there from Constantinople. When the faith had been established in Russia and the internal administration consolidated, the Church of Russia gained its autonomy, and later its complete independence, but the bonds existing between the Mother Church of Constantinople and the great Daughter Church have remained close and unbroken down to present times.

The steadfastness in Faith, shown by the Church of Russia in the

persecutions and martyrdoms of to-day is clear proof that that Church is worthy of having inherited not only the faith, but also the sufferings of the much-tried Church of Constantinople.

Such, in brief, was the missionary work of the Church of Constantinople. Behind it was a long and glorious tradition of struggle on behalf of the Christian Faith; it was allied to an Empire which formed a mighty bulwark of civilization round it, and was established in a city, in which flourished Letters and Science and where there were unbounded means for activity. In such surroundings, the Church of Constantinople was, in effect, the power which guided those who had returned to the path of Christian civilization. No one, of course, will deny that the Byzantine State also promoted the spread of Christianity both among those within its boundaries, and among the neighbouring races, in so far as this Christianization contributed to the consolidation of the Empire internally, and, externally, to an easier *rapprochement* with the peoples surrounding and threatening it. But, as Dr. Dvornik says, "it is an error, and an error that is committed even at the present day, to imagine the Church of Byzantium as, in principle, indifferent to all external activity." On the contrary, we have to discern in it at all times a living organism, which at times shows amazing industry and which never ceases to radiate its influence on the races that border on the Empire. And, in this it succeeded, thanks to the liberal spirit which influenced its dealings with foreign peoples. The Church of Constantinople converted into an inalienable right the principle that peoples which have gained their political emancipation, are entitled to independence of ecclesiastical administration, as long as the Christian Faith is not thereby imperilled. Likewise, the Church of Constantinople, in maintaining Greek as the liturgical language, that is the language of its people, at the same time permitted its missionaries not only to translate the Gospels and the Ecclesiastical writings into the language of the peoples with whom they consorted, but also, when, as often happened, they had invented the alphabet of their language, to become the founders of the national philology. "The Church of Byzantium," says Charles Diehl, "showed itself tolerant and liberal-minded; it realized that it must respect both persons and nations."

C.—The Œcumenical Patriarchate the Legal Defender of the Enslaved Christians.

But, if it is to the Church of Constantinople that we owe the spread of Christianity among the peoples of the East, it is to its strength and activity that we owe the preservation of their Christianity at the time when the flood of Asiatic barbarism overran the Byzantine

lands and carried along in its wake the Balkan races which in the meantime had evolved into political independence. Just as, in other matters, the Patriarchate of Constantinople was indissolubly bound up with the Byzantine Empire, so, too, its jurisdiction was increased or decreased in proportion to the expansion or contraction of this Empire, that is, it followed the fortunes of the Empire. Although, in the beginning, the Arabic conquests subjected only the other Patriarchates in the East, in the few centuries before the Capture, the evil spread to the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire, when very many of the Metropolies were removed from the catalogue of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, after their populations had either been destroyed or had turned to Islam. And, even when they were preserved, as in the case of a few Christian communities in the East, the bond of union with the centre became, if not impossible, very difficult to maintain, owing to a lack of immediate communication. And the evil was transferred to Europe when the Turks crossed the Hellespont, and the strongholds of Byzantium began to fall one after the other until the fatal day when Constantinople itself fell. The fall of Constantinople, which for a thousand years had been the Acropolis of Christian civilization in the East, did not mean to the Patriarchate the secession of this or that section, but the complete enslavement of its whole area beneath a foreign and un-Christian yoke. The condition of the Orthodox Church, during this period, bears a great similarity to that of the Church during the first centuries. But just as the early church, in spite of all persecutions, succeeded in preserving the flame of Christianity, and at the proper time in spreading it further, so, too, the Church of Constantinople in the midst of unheard-of sufferings, and bloodshed, contrived to maintain intact the faith of its children, and to contribute to their spiritual and national regeneration. We do not turn a blind eye to the dark spots of its history, unfortunate concomitants of adverse circumstances and human imperfections, but neither are we justified in disregarding the shining light which, radiating from this Church, pierced the dark horizon of slavery. The Orthodox Church of Constantinople thus proved to be the stronghold of Eastern Christendom. How this came about is the other point I wish to deal with.

Although discussion about the reasons which moved the Conqueror to recognize a kind of autonomy among the subjected Christians, in granting them special privileges, has not yet ended, it is certain that the so-called privileges were nothing new, that is, they do not appear for the first time after the fall of Constantinople. These privileges in relation to the religion and religious head of the subjected peoples, were conceded at various periods, though not in so official a form, by the Arab invaders, to the Christians of Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia and Egypt. This concession was due to the

theocratic character of the Moslem State and to the principle of the Koran, according to which the peoples which recognized the Bible, that is, Jews and Christians, must not be interfered with in the practice of their religion. And the Conqueror, following in the footsteps of his predecessors, applied the same rules to his new subjects, as were in use from the first appearance of Islam, with this difference, that for reasons of political expediency he gave them an official and solemn character. These privileges were, as is known, conferred on the first Patriarch after the Fall, Gennadius, after his election and presentation to the Sultan, according to the custom prevalent in Byzantine times. By these privileges the Patriarch is recognized as the spiritual head of clergy, laity, churches and monasteries and the administrator of their estates, which were declared exempt from taxation.

Simultaneously, the Patriarch acquired also a political status, being regarded as the ethnarch of the subjected Christians, and their official representative before the political authorities. And so, by a gradual process, there evolved a special *status quo* for the Christian peoples in Turkey, by which the Bishops in the provinces had a relation to the local authorities analogous to that of the Patriarch in Constantinople. And under the ægis of the Church, there was established the system of communities by which the leaders of each community constituted the Council of the Elders, which, with the local Bishops, were recognized by the political authorities as bodies representative of the Christians.

But this protection, willingly accorded by the Œcumenical Patriarchate, was brought into effect only after great struggles and sacrifices, of which the first victims were its clergy. Violence and arbitrariness often moved those in power to disregard their undertakings, while respect for freedom of conscience proved an empty word. The history of the years after the Capture, is a long and sustained series of outrages and humiliations upon the representatives of the Church, who were striving to prevent and thwart wholesale Islamization of the Christians. A writer of the seventeenth century describing this danger states that it threatened to erase the Christian name from Turkey in Europe.

The privileges of the Patriarchate, which had been so solemnly recognized by the Conqueror, came to be so disregarded that fifty Patriarchs were elevated and removed from the Throne within eighty years, and a long succession of other Patriarchs suffered all manner of violence. In this desperate struggle there are not lacking, perhaps, Patriarchs and Metropolitans who acted unwisely, who showed weakness and lack of steadfastness, who forgot their mission, and became instruments of intrigue and material interests. But what do these few exceptions signify in the face of multitudes of

Bishops and clergy who, like good shepherds, offered even their lives on behalf of their flocks? And it is precisely owing to the self-sacrifice of its ministers that the Church succeeded while struggling with innumerable obstacles, in keeping alight the flame of Christianity in the hearts of the people. And not only this; it was the Church which worked so profitably for their spiritual culture, and led the peoples under its sway to a new autonomous political life.

Owing to the general spiritual decadence which followed the capture of Constantinople, the Church did not, during this period, produce theologians comparable to those who made its name famous in earlier periods of its history. In spite of this, no one can deny that the Church did produce men capable of preserving the special character of Eastern Christianity against the attempts made from outside to alienate this character. If one excepts certain Orthodox countries which were not reached, for reasons of a political nature, by the influence of the ecclesiastical centre in Constantinople, or, in which, if this influence was present, it had to face the weapons of propaganda employed by the political authorities, the Church of Constantinople can boast that only an insignificant number of those originally Orthodox migrated to the Roman Church, and a still more insignificant number to Protestantism. How vigorous was this struggle against foreign propaganda is testified by the history of the centuries subsequent to the Capture, and by the multitude of polemical and "apologetic" works which appeared during that period. The Church of Constantinople, a vigilant guardian of its trust, defended it stoutly by the publication of writings, by the calling of Synods, by Declarations of Faith, by Encyclicals directed against heresies and errors, and, above all, by the self-sacrifice of its shepherds. Only thus was it able, in spite of all the intervening difficulties, to preserve intact the Christian Faith and to hand it over to the Daughter Churches, which evolved their national independence after a servitude of many centuries.

The storm which broke over the East upon the capture of Constantinople was not confined only to the destruction of the political life of the peoples, but also brought the same destruction to their cultural achievement. Already one century after the Capture, education is described as being in a wretched state, inasmuch as, on the one hand, the Conqueror, through ignorance, destroyed all literary treasures, and the people were totally deprived of means for their development and education. This condition is noticed not only among those peoples whose civilization had taken place only a few centuries previously, but also among the Greek people, which had behind it, in addition to the ancient classical development, a long spiritual development combined with several renaissances at various

periods of the Byzantine State. Zygomalas in a letter to Crusius says: "I perceive that all good things have migrated from Hellenic parts to you . . . wisdom, the sciences, the finest arts, education and the remainder of the Graces' chorus; and the glory of the Hellenic Graces has been destroyed by a cruel age."

In the midst of this darkest Middle Age of the East, the Church, bringing security like a lighthouse, alone shone; since it was the Church alone which devoted itself to the cultivation of Letters. To this cultivation there contributed first of all the desire for the preservation of the Faith, which the Church regarded as indissolubly linked with the origins of Christianity, which, in its turn, it regarded as linked with the Greek language, in which Christianity had formulated its Doctrine and Worship. But the Church devoted itself to the study of its ancestral treasures, and for the additional reason that only by this study could it withstand the propagandists who came armed with all the intellectual weapons liberally provided for them by the previous Renaissance of Letters in the West. It is absolutely natural that this cultural development was, in its main part, Greek, since Greek was always the language of the Church of Constantinople, and the language prevalent in the East, to such an extent, indeed, that it was used even by the Conquerors in their diplomatic relations, which were carried on with foreigners through the medium of Greeks. And although this education was for the most part necessarily ecclesiastical and theological, yet it did not neglect the general studies and sciences, which were taught in the schools established in various towns of the Ottoman Empire. What must not, above all, be forgotten is this: that the principal and most generous source of help for purposes of education was the Church, which set aside for this work not only the revenue of its ecclesiastical estates, but even the subscriptions of its members which were specifically earmarked for the support of the clergy. When one examines the list of Higher Schools which were at that time in existence, one finds that the teachers are for the most part clergy while, for the so-called common schools, use was made of the narthex of each church, and the teacher was the incumbent of the parish. Moreover, just as it was the Church which, in times of crisis, thus preserved Letters among the subjected peoples, so it was this Church, which, in easier times, promoted their renaissance.

D.—The Church of Constantinople and the Balkan Nations.

Although the primary purpose of the Church of Constantinople, as of every Church on earth, was always to bring about the regeneration of individuals and nations, and to lead them to a higher life, having

to do with the perfection of man, yet it did not neglect any means which might bring all Christians to a life of individual and national freedom.

Those who assume that it was possible for the Church of Constantinople to organize, from the beginning, a programme of activity, tending to the political emancipation of the Christian races, are proved to be ignorant of the circumstances in which this Church found itself, and the conditions of its every activity. The decentralization prevailing at that time in the Ottoman Empire was in many ways fatal to the interests of the Church; while the continuous disturbances in the Empire rendered it difficult if not impossible for the central government of the Church to be in close touch with the distant provinces.

Consequently, the only arrangement possible was this, that the local representatives of the Œcumenical Patriarchate should fulfil their duties conscientiously under every given circumstance. But did they do so, in the right spirit of impartiality? In our view, those who charge the Church of Constantinople with having shown a bias towards one nationality, that is, the Greek, are unmindful of many things; first of all, that the idea of nationalism which from the beginning of the nineteenth century assumes such importance in the life of the different peoples, had not, in the first three centuries after the Capture, yet replaced the idea of Christianity, or, since we are talking of the East, of Orthodoxy. Secondly, that the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which succeeded to the Byzantine Empire, however much it may have been called "Roman" by the Turks, and its component members "Romaioi," was in essence Greek, and its clergy for the most part Greeks, who carried on the Byzantine Traditions. Thirdly, that the other Balkan nationalities which, at a later date, were included in the Ottoman Empire, and still later even, within the realm of the Church of Constantinople, had, for approximately three centuries led an independent ecclesiastical life under their own Bishops or Patriarchs, and were only admitted within the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople when they realized that their isolation threatened their complete downfall. Finally, if some of the Church's representatives abused the advantage of their position, and, under pressure from their political superiors, exerted pressure on their flocks, this occurred not only in non-Greek parts, but also in Greek. "The isolated happenings must not be regarded as general," says Professor Sokolov, "besides, if we take into account the corrupting influence of the Turkish yoke, many of these happenings were not only intelligible, but also pardonable. The Œcumenical Patriarchate evokes admiration in that it bore with much self-sacrifice, the weary cross imposed on it by the inscrutable will of God." Another Russian writer says, "The privileges granted

by the Conqueror combined with the undoubted intellectual superiority of the Greeks over the neighbouring races of the Hæmus, who were inferior in education, contributed to the consolidation of the exceptional position of the Greeks. . . . The strength is amazing of this people who, by itself, was able to withstand the force of barbarism for so many centuries, and which, in the midst of its trials, was enabled, not only itself to be saved, but, for itself and the other Orthodox peoples, to preserve intact and immaculate the Faith which had been entrusted to its keeping." But what, perhaps more than anything else, tends to refute the charges brought against the Patriarchate on this point are the hostile criticisms made in opposition to the former point of view by a Greek historian, who condemns the Patriarchate for not having taken full advantage of the exceptional position of the Œcumenical Throne in order to Hellenize the Balkan peoples. "However much the Patriarch's status was restricted, and the privileges granted to him circumscribed, yet he was always the ecclesiastical and political leader of all the Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire—Greeks, Bulgars, Serbs and Albanians. The duty of the Patriarchate was the strengthening of Hellenism by the dissemination of the language among those different races, that is, by their Hellenization. And the Patriarchate failed in its duty."

What is here considered a dereliction of duty, is in our opinion a proof that the Patriarchate in its guidance of the peoples within its dominion made no distinction between the different nationalities, although, in truth, it was, by origin and tradition, Hellenic.

Such then were the services which, for fifteen consecutive centuries, the Œcumenical Patriarchate rendered to the cause of Christianity in that sphere where it was appointed to work by God's providence. As the centre of a vigorous religious life and activity, not only did its spirit inform the various peoples, who were incorporated in the Byzantine Empire, but also it freely scattered the seed of the Gospel and gained millions of souls for Christ. Concentrating in itself great spiritual forces, it became the leader of Eastern Christendom in championing and proclaiming the Christian Faith. It was the Œcumenical Patriarchate which first developed and applied the principle, that every nation, as long as it preserves its unity with the whole Church in Faith and Order, is entitled to acquire ecclesiastical liberty and self-administration. Never exacting absolute supremacy over the whole Church, it always exerted the influence derived from its position on behalf of the Sister Churches which found themselves in unfavourable circumstances. By its liberal spirit it became the founder of countless Churches, and thus laid the foundations of the ecclesiastical, spiritual, philological and national development of the peoples of the East. And when, by the inscrutable will of God,

it fell to its lot to champion the Christian Faith and its children against the danger of Islam, it did so with devotion and self-sacrifice, and itself was the first to suffer persecution and outrage. It was the Patriarchate which was the Pole Star to which its children turned when seeking the direction of their steps; which kept alight the flame of spiritual and secular education; which was the loving Mother who nurtured her children with the hope of national emancipation. And when the nations, one after another, threw off the yoke of slavery and achieved a life of independence, the Patriarchate of Constantinople ungrudgingly submitted to every curtailment of its power; for with satisfaction it saw the daughter Churches, which it had begotten in the faith, rising up again like the Phœnix from its ashes. "He must increase, but I must decrease." (John, 3, 30.)

But the historical mission of the Patriarchate of Constantinople was not ended. After justifying, by means of life-long struggles, the spiritual and moral supremacy over the other Churches of the East (which had been assured to it by successive Synods), the Œcumenical Patriarchate to this day remains the spiritual head to which these Churches turn when seeking guidance and support.

And although it has suffered the greatest of trials, condemned to a new Babylonian Captivity, and by this has lost a large part of its position as the leader of the religious life and movement of the Churches of the East, it does not give in, but continues to wait in prayer and hope. The vigilant guardian of historical traditions, it hopes that once again it will lead Orthodoxy, which is now struggling for the adaptation of its administrative system to new historical conditions, and newly-arisen needs. Closely following the new spirit, which prevails throughout the post-war world, tending towards understanding and re-union, it hopes that it will be vouchsafed to it to guide the Orthodox peoples in this high purpose. Forming the meeting-point of two worlds, the East and the West, its hope is that to it will fall the lot to bring, a second time, the torch of the Gospel to the East, where, for two thousand years, it shed its light profusely. That is the reason why Christendom should retain undiminished its interest in the fortunes of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which is now humbled, but faces the future with every hope.

THE GRAND DUCHESS ELISABETH.

By Archbishop Anastasy.

IT is not in the lifetime of every generation that such a blessing of heaven is vouchsafed to it as was the Grand Duchess Elisabeth Feodorovna to her epoch.* Her personality presented that rare blending of a lofty christian soul, nobility of character and tenderness of heart with a singularly refined and cultured mind. Hers was an extraordinarily delicate and many-sided spiritual organism. Her very outward appearance reflected the beauty and sublimity of her spirit; upon her brow lay the impress of inborn lofty dignity which set her far above her environment. Being extremely modest she would endeavour sometimes to pass unobserved, but this was impossible, for wherever she went the question could be applied to her: "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun?" (Song of Solomon, 6. 10.) It seemed as though she exhaled the pure fragrance of the lily. White was the colour she loved—was it not because it reflected the purity of her soul? Hers was a perfectly balanced nature in which no quality held unique preponderance over the other. Femininity was allied to strength of character; kindness did not degenerate into weakness and blind credulity; the gift of discrimination, so highly esteemed by ascetics, never forsook her even in the most spontaneous impulses of her heart. Perhaps these traits were in a measure due to her English education under the surveillance of her grandmother Queen Victoria. Her tastes and habits were distinctly English, just as English came more readily to her lips than her native German.

According to her own testimony, the Grand Duchess's spiritual development was strongly influenced by the example of St. Elisabeth of Thuringia or Hungary, who through her daughter, Sophia, became one of the founders of the House of Hesse. A contemporary of the Crusades, this wonderful woman was imbued with the spirit of her epoch. In her, deep piety was united to a self-sacrificing love towards her fellow-men. Her husband resented her charities as reckless spending and frequently ill-treated her. Left early a widow she led a wandering life of hardship and privation. Later when she was once more in a position to relieve the sick and suffering she devoted herself entirely to deeds of mercy. The profound veneration in which this saintly Princess was held by her contemporaries prompted the Roman Catholic Church to canonize her in the XIII century. The pure radiant image of this ancestress left a deep impression on the sensitive

* Before her marriage, Princess Elisabeth Louise Alexandra Alice, daughter of the Grand Duke of Hesse Ludwig IV, born 20th October, 1864.

childish soul of the little Princess Elisabeth and remained with her for life.

Her many natural gifts were enhanced by an excellent education which not only provided for her intellectual and artistic tastes, but added the practical knowledge so essential to women in the home. "The Empress (Alexandra Feodorovna, her younger sister) and I were taught everything as children," she said once in reply to a question as to how she came to be so proficient in housewifery.

Chosen to become the consort of the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch, the Grand Duchess arrived in Russia at a time when that country under the firm rule of Alexander III, imbued with a purely national spirit, had attained to the height of her power and prestige. With her customary thirst for knowledge and sensitive delicacy of feeling the youthful Grand Duchess set herself to study the national peculiarities of the Russian people, particularly their religion which has given such a profound impress to our national character and culture. She was soon subjugated by the beauty and inner spiritual richness of Orthodoxy, which she frequently contrasted with the hollow poverty of Protestantism. ("And yet they are so self-satisfied," she would add.)*

Moved by her own inner conviction the Grand Duchess resolved to join the Orthodox Church. When she told her husband of her decision, "tears involuntarily sprang to his eyes," recalled a member of their household. The Emperor Alexander III was also deeply moved, and after the ceremony of the holy Chrism blessed his sister-in-law with a precious ikon of the Saviour "*not made with hands,*" (a copy of the miraculous ikon in the chapel of the Saviour in Petrograd) and which the Grand Duchess venerated all her life. Having thus entered into communion with our faith and through it with all that went to make the soul of the Russian, the Grand Duchess was truly entitled to address her husband in the words of Ruth the Moabite: "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God." (Ruth 1. 16.) The Grand Duke's long sojourn in Moscow where he occupied the post of Governor-General, and where he and his consort were in constant touch with our ancient holy places and traditions could not fail to draw the Grand Duchess still closer to her new country.

* Of her meetings with representatives of the Roman Church the Grand Duchess would sometimes recall her visit to Rome with the late Grand Duke shortly after the jubilee of Pope Leo XIII. The latter was well aware of Sergius Alexandrovitch's staunch Orthodox principles, but nevertheless held him personally in high esteem, having made his acquaintance during the Grand Duke's sojourn in Rome in his boyhood. Owing to such long-standing acquaintance the two were able to converse freely; they even started an argument as to the exact number of Popes who bore the name of Sergius. Neither of the exalted controversalists wished to give in, and the Pope finally resorted to the library for reference. He returned somewhat abashed.

"Pardon me," said Leo XIII with a smile, "though the Pope is considered to be infallible, this time he was mistaken."

Already she devoted much time to public charities, but this was looked upon as part of the duties of her high calling and no particular merit was attached to it.

The Grand Duchess had to pay the price of her position and take part in the social life of the capital, but even then she felt the burden of its vanities. The tragic death of the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch, torn to pieces by the explosion of a bomb thrown in the middle of the sacred Kremlin (near the Nicholas Palace where the Grand Duke had taken up his residence after resigning the post of Governor-General) produced a decisive change of heart in his consort and she retired completely from the world. The sublime spirit with which she bore this trial commanded universal admiration. She even found the moral courage to visit her husband's assassin, Kaliaiev, in prison, hoping to soften and regenerate his heart by her gentleness and forgiveness. The same christian sentiment was expressed as though in the name of the martyred Grand Duke in the touching inscription from the Gospel engraved upon the memorial cross erected on the spot where he met his death: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do . . . . "

Not all, however, were capable of understanding and valuing the change worked in the Grand Duchess at its true worth. Only those who themselves had passed through such an overwhelming tragedy could realize the insecurity and delusion of wealth, fame and other earthly goods as taught us for centuries by the Gospel. The Grand Duchess's decision to dismiss her court and devote herself to the service of God and the poor appeared in the eyes of contemporary society as a rash and insane step. Waiving aside both the tears of her friends and the gossip and mockery of society, she bravely entered upon her chosen path. Though from the very outset she had mapped out for herself the perfect way, *i.e.*, the way of asceticism, her wisdom prompted her to begin the ascent of the ladder of Christian virtues by degrees.

She was no stranger to the rules of the founders of asceticism which laid down that beginners in Christian practices should learn the ways of life from others in order "not to be one's own teacher, and not to walk unguided in paths untrodden before, so as not to swerve from the right direction, to walk neither more nor less than needed, not to tire from quick running nor to fall asleep when at rest." (Hieronimus, *Letter to the monk Rusticus.*)

So she endeavoured to undertake nothing without the advice of "startsy" (aged monks of great spiritual experience) versed in spiritual matters, especially the "startsy" of the Zosima hermitage under whose guidance she implicitly placed herself. As her heavenly protectors she chose St. Sergius and St. Alexis;* to

* She also had great veneration for St. Seraphim of Sarov at whose canonisation festival she was present with the other members of the Imperial Family.

their special patronage she commended her departed consort, having interred his remains in a crypt of the Tchudov monastery (founded by St. Alexis) designed in the style of the early Roman catacombs. Her prolonged mourning for the Grand Duke when she retired as it were into the inner sanctuary of her soul and remained almost perpetually in church was the first natural barrier which separated her from her former surroundings. Her departure from the palace to the house she bought in Ordynka Street and where she reserved only two small rooms for her own personal use, signified a complete break with the past and the beginning of a new life.

Henceforward her chief care lay in the organization of a community in which the service of God would be indissolubly united with active service to the poor and needy in the name of Christ. To us, Russians, this represented quite a novel departure in organized church-charity, and therefore, attracted general attention. It was founded on the profound and irrefutable principle that no man can give to others more than he possesses himself. All we hold is of God, therefore, in Him only can we truly love our neighbours. So-called natural affection and philanthropy rapidly evaporate and pall, giving place to coldness and disillusion. Whereas he who lives in Christ is capable of rising to the summit of complete self-abnegation and of laying down his life for his friends. The Grand Duchess desired not only to imbue our social charities with the spirit of the Gospel, but to place them under the shelter of the Church and thereby gradually to attract the upper classes of society to Her. Of deep significance was the name which the Grand Duchess gave the newly-founded house—the Community of Martha and Mary—as though determining its mission in the world. The community was intended to become as it were the house of Lazarus where our Saviour so often dwelt. The sisters were called upon to unite the high lot of Mary hearkening to the eternal words of life with the service of Martha in so far as they offered hospitality to Christ in the guise of the least of His brethren. In explaining and justifying her idea, the ever-to-be-remembered foundress of the community used to say that the Saviour could not pass judgment on Martha for her hospitality which was but a tribute of her love for Him. He merely warned Martha and in her person all women against excessive fussing and cares which would divert them from the higher call of the spirit.

To be not of this world, yet to live and work in the midst of it in order to reform it—such was the foundation on which she wished to establish her community.

Anxious to be an obedient daughter of the Orthodox Church in all things, the Grand Duchess did not wish to take advantage of her privileged position and refused any exemptions from submitting to the established rules or precepts of the church authorities. On the

contrary, she readily submitted to the least desires of the latter, even when these were opposed to her own inclinations. For instance, at one time she seriously contemplated restoring the ancient order of deaconesses, and in this was ardently supported by the Metropolitan of Moscow, Vladimir. This idea, however, was misunderstood and opposed by Bishop Hermogen of Saratov (later transferred to Tobolsk where he met a martyr's death). Without the slightest foundation he accused the Grand Duchess of Protestant leanings and compelled her to abandon her favourite scheme. (He repented of his mistake later.) Though misunderstood in her highest motives the Grand Duchess did not let disappointment quench her lofty spirit and devoted herself heart and soul to her beloved "nursling," the Community of Martha and Mary. No wonder it flourished rapidly and attracted numerous sisters both from among the aristocracy and from the humbler classes. In its inner mode of life it was almost monastic. Its outward activities consisted in ministering to the sick, both outdoor patients and those in the hospital attached to the community;* in material and spiritual aid to the poor; in housing homeless children and orphans of whom so many go to ruin in big cities. The Grand Duchess devoted special attention to the hapless children of the down-and-outs of the Khitrov market (one of the worst Moscow slums with doss-houses of low repute), born in that murky "underworld," branded with a curse for the sins of their fathers and doomed to wither before expanding. Many of these were placed in special homes where they soon revived both morally and physically; others were left merely under surveillance. The Grand Duchess's enterprising spirit and sensitive nature led her to seek new ways and forms of charity which sometimes reflected the westernizing influence of the country of her birth and early youth, more advanced than we were in organized social work and mutual aid on the principle of self-help. It was on this basis that she created an association of messenger boys who were lodged and fed in a well-appointed home of their own and taught the value of honest work; she opened hostels for girl students and so on. Not all these institutions were directly connected with the Community of Martha and Mary, but all were like rays radiating from the common centre of light and were focussed as it were in the person of its Sister-Superior who embraced them all in her loving care. Having chosen as her mission not only service to mankind in

* It should be mentioned here that the Grand Duchess had in view the training of special sisters as spiritual consolers to the dying. "Is it not strange," she would say, "that out of mistaken kindness we try to delude these sufferers into thinking they will recover? Should we not rather render them a greater service by preparing them a Christian passage into eternity?"

general, but also the spiritual reformation of our society,* the Grand Duchess wished to present her message to Russians in the more intelligible and familiar garb of church art and the beauty of the Orthodox rite. All the churches erected by her, especially the principal one of the Community of Martha and Mary built by the architect Shchussev and decorated by the artistic Nesterov in the antique Novgorod-Pskov style, were gems of architectural and artistic beauty in every detail of their outward and internal decoration. The chapel of the burial crypt underneath the latter created a profound impression on all who visited it by its atmosphere of mystic all-pervading peace. Public worship as conducted at the Community always maintained a high degree of perfection owing to the exceptional pastoral virtues of the father confessor chosen by the Foundress. From time to time she also invited hither for celebration or preaching renowned members of the clergy from Moscow and other places collecting like a busy bee the honey from every flower. A true Christian woman, she never "finished her training" to use Gogol's expression, but all her life long remained a pupil equally conscientious, docile and humble. The Community of Martha and Mary, both in its outward aspect and its inner life, like all things created by the Grand Duchess bore a stamp not only of spirituality, but of refinement and culture, not because she attached any value to these in themselves, but because such was the unconscious influence of her own creative spirit. While concentrating her activities on the community the Grand Duchess did not sever her ties with other charitable and religious and cultural institutions and organizations with which she had been connected since her early days in Moscow. Foremost among these was the Orthodox Palestine Society to which she was deeply attached, if only for the reason that it was founded by her consort, the Grand Duke Sergius Alexandrovitch, as a tribute from the profound piety of an Orthodox Russian for the Holy Land. Having succeeded him as chairman of the Society she followed in his footsteps in a holy zeal for Zion and in her tireless care for the needs of the Russian pilgrims to the Holy Land. Although she had already visited the Holy City with the late Grand Duke, it was her heart's desire to join them in their pilgrimage, but the

* The Grand Duchess could not fail to be struck by the profound difference between Russian and English mentality. In England there is no division between scientific learning and religiousness. The most enlightened persons are not ashamed to confess their faith in "Christ Crucified," or to fulfil their religious duties as do the simple folk. There Christianity still retains its sublime hold on the national life and all forms of social work are imbued with its spirit. It naturally follows that without any self-seeking on their part, the clergy in England are raised to the top of the social tree and enjoy an honoured position unequalled in any Christian country in the world. Perhaps the stability of British culture is due to this peculiarity of the British national character as well as its political power itself. Not for nothing was it said that Queen Victoria when questioned by an American wherein lay the secret of England's strength, pointed to the Bible and replied, "In this small Book."

increasing strain of her manifold duties rendered a prolonged absence from Russia impossible. Alas, no one at the time could foresee that she would come to Jerusalem after her death, there to find her last resting place. As her mind was always on a level with her heart, she exhibited in the administration of the Palestine Society not only her zeal and love for the Holy Land, but such a thorough knowledge of affairs as gave the impression that she had had personal experience in the management of its institutions. In the last years before the War she was preoccupied with a scheme for building a hostel and church of St. Nicholas worthy of Russia's name at Bari. A design and model of the building made in the old Russian style by Shchussev always stood in her reception room.

Reports and interviews, dealing with all manner of requests and petitions which poured in from all parts of Russia, and other tasks, took up the whole of her day, leaving her well-nigh exhausted. This, however, did not prevent her from spending the night at a sick bed or attending night vigils in the Kremlin or other Moscow churches and monasteries beloved by the Russian people. The spirit overcame the weakness of the worn-out flesh.* She concealed her exertions, and always appeared in public with a bright face and sweetly smiling lips. Only when alone or in the midst of intimate associates her countenance would relax and a look of wistful melancholy, the seal of higher souls pining in this prison world of ours, would steal into her eyes. Having renounced almost everything on earth, she seemed to shine like a beautiful light with the inner radiance of her soul shedding warmth and tenderness wherever she went. None knew how better or more tactfully to give pleasure to others, to minister to each according to his or her needs and spiritual character. She not only knew how to weep with them that weep, but what is much harder, to rejoice with them that rejoice. Without being a nun in the exact sense of the word, she fulfilled better than any nun the sublime precept of St. Nilus the Sinaite: "Blessed is the monk who next to God holds every man to be a god." To discover the best in every human creature and "invoke mercy to the fallen" was ever her heart's desire. Nor did her meekness prevent her from exhibiting righteous indignation in the face of injustice. She was all the more ready to accuse her own self for any lapse or even involuntary mistake. May I be permitted to cite one instance which testifies to that trait of her character and also to how far sincerity overcame her natural reserve and the strict claims of etiquette. When I was suffragan bishop in Moscow, she asked me once to preside at a meeting of a purely

* Her sole relaxation were pilgrimages to various holy places in Russia. Yet even then the people would not let her enjoy the solace of retirement. In her they venerated the double halo of her royal birth and lofty piety, and wherever she went she was enthusiastically welcomed, so that much against her will her progress everywhere assumed the character of a triumphant procession.

lay society, the activities of which had nothing to do with the Church. At a loss what to reply, I felt greatly disconcerted. She at once perceived my embarrassment. "Pardon me," she said decidedly, "I am talking nonsense," and thus settled my dilemma.

Numerous organizations as well as great numbers of private persons attracted by the Grand Duchess's exalted position and affability beset her with requests for assistance, patronage or intercession before the higher authorities in Moscow and Petrograd. All found a ready response except to petitions of a political nature; these she resolutely waived aside considering interference in political affairs to be incompatible with her new calling. All institutions connected with the Church, charities or culture and art enjoyed her special patronage. She was also keenly active for the preservation of the most precious ancient national traditions and customs in which her beloved Moscow was so rich.

The Jubilee celebrations of 1912 offered an unexpected opportunity for the manifestation of her zeal. The details of this affair are still known to a very limited few even from among those who took part in the proceedings. When drawing up the programme of the centenary celebrations of the War for the Fatherland (1812), animated discussions arose in the special commission in Moscow about how to mark the 30th August, the closing day of the celebrations in Moscow whither the Tsar was due to arrive from the field of the battle of Borodino. The representative of the Ministry of the Imperial Court proposed that the crowning event of the day should be the Emperor's visit to the Zemstvo Peasant Industries' Museum, which had absolutely no connection with the historical memories of 1812.

Others supported my proposal that this day, for centuries held sacred in Russia as the anniversary of St. Alexander Nevsky should be marked by a solemn Te Deum of thanksgiving in the Red square as a fitting climax to the celebrations commemorating the exploit of self-sacrifice achieved by the Russian people with the blessing of the Church a century ago. The Court department, however, refused to give in, shielding themselves behind "Imperial orders," which were, of course, impossible to verify. Nothing, therefore, remained for me as a representative of the ecclesiastical authorities, and my supporters but to submit to the inevitable. Meeting the Grand Duchess I told her of the incident.

She was greatly perturbed by my narrative and said: "I will try and write of this to the Tsar, for," she added with a slight smile, "to us women everything is allowed."

A week later she informed me that the Emperor had altered the programme in the desired manner.

The day of the 30th August subsequently presented a magnificent and supremely soul-stirring spectacle of a truly all-national religious

and withal patriotic manifestation, which those present will never forget, and for which Moscow was indebted to the Grand Duchess who on that occasion gave proof not only of her loyalty to the Church, but of a profound and purely Russian historical intuition.

After the outbreak of the War she devoted herself entirely to the care of the sick and wounded whom she visited both in the Moscow hospitals and at the front. Calumny did not spare her as it did not spare the late Empress, accusing them both of exaggerated solicitude for the German prisoners of war. The Grand Duchess bore this bitter and utterly undeserved affront with her usual magnanimity.

When the revolutionary tempest broke out, she met it with amazing fortitude and calm. It was as though she stood high upon an immutable rock and from thence, her spiritual gaze fixed upon eternal vistas, fearlessly faced the raging billows surging at her feet.

She felt not a shade of resentment towards the excesses of the frenzied mob. "The people are like children, they are not responsible for what is taking place. They are led astray by Russia's enemies," she would say gently. Nor was she distressed by the great sufferings and humiliations which fell to the lot of the Imperial Family, her nearest kith and kin. "They will become purified through this and drawn nearer to God," she remarked once, her whole countenance illuminated by a soft radiance. But she suffered acutely when insulting calumny spun its wicked web round that beloved Family, particularly during the War. To prevent any possibility of further gossip the Grand Duchess avoided any allusion to the subject, and when ill-bred curiosity nevertheless reverted to it, she immediately rebuked it by her expressive silence. Once only, on her return from Tsarskoe Selo she let fall the remark: "That dreadful man (*i.e.*, Rasputin) wanted to estrange me from them, but thank God he failed." Such was the winning grace of her personality that even the revolutionaries felt its spell when first they came to search the premises of the Community. One of them (apparently a student) even commended the life of the sisters by remarking that he saw no trace of luxury, but only cleanliness and order which were not blamable in themselves. The Grand Duchess seeing his obvious sincerity started a conversation with him on the peculiar traits of Christian and Socialist ideals. "Who knows," replied her unknown interlocutor, "perhaps we pursue the same goal—only by different ways." And with these words he left the Community.

"It seems we are still unworthy of a martyr's crown," the Sister-Superior replied when the sisters congratulated her on the happy ending of this, their first meeting with the Bolsheviks. But that crown was not far distant. To everyone's surprise during the last months of 1917 and the beginning of 1918 the Community of

Martha and Mary and its Sister-Superior were left to carry on their usual activities unmolested and even received a certain amount of assistance in the shape of food supplies. The blow when it fell at Easter in 1918 was, therefore, unexpected and all the more severe. The Grand Duchess was arrested and sent to Ekaterinburg. His Holiness the patriarch Tikhon tried to intervene on her behalf through various church organizations which at that early stage the Bolsheviks held in certain consideration, but in vain. At her first place of exile the Grand Duchess was surrounded with a certain degree of comfort. She was interned in a convent, where all the nuns did all they could for her; her greatest solace was being allowed to assist at all the church services. Far more stringent were the conditions of her second place of detention, Alopaevsk, whither she was transferred with sister Barbara, her faithful attendant, and confined with some of the Grand Dukes in one of the school buildings. Nevertheless her lofty courage never forsook her and from time to time she sent messages of cheer and comfort to the sorrowing sisters of her Community. This lasted until the fatal night of the 5/18 July. That night, she, together with the other royal captives and her brave fellow-sufferer, Sister Barbara, was suddenly seized, driven out of Alopaevsk in a motor-car and apparently thrown alive down a disused neighbouring shaft.* When later the bodies were exhumed it was revealed that to the last minute she had endeavoured to minister to the severely injured Grand Dukes. The neighbouring peasants who watched from afar the execution of these unknown strangers, could hear for a long time a sound of mysterious chanting proceeding from underground. It was she, the great martyr, who thus chanted the burial hymns over herself and the others until "the silver cord was loosed and the golden bowl broken." (Eccl. 12. 6.) Thus was the martyr's crown for which she yearned placed upon her brow and she was admitted to the host of those of whom John the Contemplator of Divine Mysteries says: "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues stood before the throne, and before the Lamb clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands. These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." (Rev. VII. 9. 14.) She passed through the world like a radiant vision leaving a shining trail. Together with all other martyrs for the Russian land she stands as an expiatory victim for the sins of the old Russia and as the foundation of the new, which will arise upon the ashes of these new martyrs. The meaning of such lives is perpetual; their names are inscribed on earth and in

* Only the Grand Duke Sergius Mikhailovitch was shot with a revolver during the drive.

heaven and endure throughout the ages. It was not in vain that popular opinion called her a saint already in her lifetime.* As though to reward her earthly service and especially her love for the Holy Land, her martyred remains (found in the mine in a state of incorruption according to the testimony of witnesses), are destined to rest near the very spot of our Lord's Passion and Resurrection. Her remains with those of the members of the Imperial Family who met their death with her (the Grand Duke Sergius Mikhailovitch, Princes John, Igor and Constantine Constantinovitch and the son of the Grand Duke Paul Alexandrovitch, Prince Palei) and sister Barbara were exhumed by order of Admiral Kolchak and brought first to Irkutsk and thence to Peking where they reposed for a long time in the cemetery chapel at the Russian Mission. Later, the Marchioness of Milford Haven, sister of the Grand Duchess to whom she was particularly attached, obtained permission to transfer the coffins with her remains and those of Sister Barbara to Palestine via Shanghai and the Suez Canal. On the 15th January, 1920, the remains of the two inseparable martyrs were solemnly brought to Jerusalem, where they were met by the British authorities, the Greek and Russian clergy, the numerous Russian colony and local poulation. A day later the interment took place conducted by the Venerable head of the Church of Zion, His Holiness the Patriarch Damianos, assisted by a host of clergy.

The crypt of the Russian church of St. Mary Magdalen was fittingly chosen to be her last resting place. The church itself, built in memory of the Empress Marie Alexandrovna by her august children, was not unknown to the Grand Duchess who was present at its consecration in 1888, together with the Grand Duke. It is the most beautiful and best designed of all our churches in Palestine. Situated on the picturesque slope of the Mount of Olives, its colourful and purely Russian outline meets the gaze from afar and carries one's thoughts to Russia so far off yet so near to the Holy Land. The departed martyr would not have chosen herself a more fitting resting place could she have foreseen that it would be her lot temporarily to rest outside her own beloved Community where she had already prepared herself a burial place.

Here everything harmonizes with her spirit: the golden cupolas of the church glinting in the sunshine amid the verdure of the olives and cypresses; its artistic internal decoration stamped with Verestchagine's genius, and the very character of the sacred pictures themselves as though penetrated through and through by

* It is significant that soon after the birth of the Grand Duchess, her mother, Princess Alice, a woman of lofty nature and gentleness of heart, wrote to Queen Victoria about the name given to the little Princess: "We like Elisabeth on account of St. Elisabeth of Hungary being the ancestress of the Hessian as well as the Saxon House." The late Grand Duchess kept the name after she joined the Orthodox Church, having chosen St. Elisabeth, mother of St. John the Baptist, as her patron saint. (September 5th.)

the radiance of our Lord's Resurrection. Still nearer and dearer to her heart is the aroma of holiness pervading and surrounding her last resting place. Beneath spreads the unique panorama of the Holy City with the imposing dome of the Holy Sepulchre dominating it. At the foot of the hill lies the garden of Gethsemane, the scene of our Lord's agony and bloody sweat; and beyond Gethsemane, the burial place of the Mother of our Lord. To the left, half concealed in a lap of the hill is Bethany, actual home of Martha and Mary, sisters of Lazarus whom here our Lord had summoned from the grave; while above, the church of St. Mary Magdalen crowns the joyful Mount of Olives whence our Saviour rose in glory to heaven and from there speaks to those who through tribulation have remained faithful to Him unto death: "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment, and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life. To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and sit down with my Father in his throne." (Rev. III, 5. 21.)

CHRISTIAN EAST MEETS CHRISTIAN WEST.

By Dr. D. A. Lowrie.

WE hear frequently of new developments in the relationships among different branches of the Christian faith, but probably no event in recent times has had quite such special significance as the "Consultation" just closed in Athens, Greece. Influential leaders of most of the Eastern Orthodox Churches met with representatives of the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, themselves representing five Western countries and at least as many Protestant denominations beside the Church of England, to discuss the best means for their co-operation. An outsider, watching the proceedings, would have been struck by the bizarre combination of types: alert, smooth-shaven laymen in business dress, together with venerable hierarchs from the Orthodox East, stately and impressive in their flowing robes, their high black caps with draped veils and their patriarchal beards.

This outward diversity was significant of the groups which had come together, trusted spokesmen for youth work in the two halves of the Christian world, East and West. There were men like Chrysostom, Archbishop of Athens and All Greece; Evlogie, Metropolitan of all Russian Churches in Western Europe; Simedrea, flashing-eyed vicar of the Patriarch of Roumania; or Nikolai, Bishop of Okhrida, the dark-faced mystic whose lectures in the United States and England two years ago attracted such marked attention. There were professors: Zankov, of Sofia, well-known

figure at Stockholm and Lausanne ; Zenkovsky, leading authority on religious education in the Russian Academy ; Parenta, Rector of the Theological Seminary in Yugo-Slavia, whose half-hour speech in Latin so astonished and delighted an international student conference held there three years ago. There were members of the World's Alliance : Stange of Germany, Koechlin from Switzerland, 't Hooft of Holland, and Dr. John R. Mott, President of the World's Committee of Y.M.C.A.s, convener of the gathering. Of the twelve representatives of the clergy present, four were Archbishops, four Bishops, two Arch-priests. The other twenty-eight were laymen from many walks of life, all closely related to the Y.M.C.A.s in their respective countries.

As has been noted, it was the Y.M.C.A. which precipitated the four-day discussion. Among the crowding new problems in the Eastern Churches arising from their sudden confrontation with the West after the War, none has been more actual than this organization with its new methods of approach to youth, its foreign representatives, its red triangle emblem which some believe to be the mark of the devil and others think is a secret symbol of freemasonry. This organization, at the same time, has claimed to be a friend of the Church. Friendly or not, it should be dealt with cautiously.

Some such attitude as this prevailed eight or ten years ago, in many of the countries where the Orthodox Eastern Church is predominant. But the past years have seen great developments in increasing sympathy and co-operation. The foreign representatives remained long enough to help train native leaders, then most of them returned to England or America whence they had come. One by one, Church leaders began to give their assistance. Boys' camps, friendship groups, games and schools and study-groups began to show results in an increasing number of young people in the Churches. Young men began to assist in the work of the Church, in hospital and prison visitation ; some decided to study for the priesthood.

There have been critics who claimed the Eastern Church was stiff and moribund, unable and unwilling to make any changes in our new age. Their theory explodes like a pricked balloon in view of the way the Orthodox Church accepted co-operation with this Western organization, once confidence was established. To-day high Churchmen are working on its committees in all the Balkan countries. The Archbishop of Athens and All Greece is honorary president of the national Y.M.C.A. Council of that country. In Roumania, the Bishop who is Vicar to the Patriarch is a member of the National Committee. These men and dozens of others have been giving not only their names, but much of their time and effort to the work of the Y.M.C.A.s in their respective lands.

More, they have helped to fight its battles against conservative suspicions, such as those mentioned above, and co-operation increased

A PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN AT THE ATHENS "CONSECRATION"

as both parties came to understand each other better. Each year has seen closer sympathy and collaboration. Not that this was achieved without some difficulty: both in method and in spirit, the new movement had much to learn. So, it proved, had the Orthodox Church. To help clear up points of uncertainty, there was arranged, two years ago, in Sofia, a consultation similar to this just held in Athens. It was an unprecedented gathering: never before had a world-wide organization asked to have a conference with representatives, even if unofficial, of the Eastern Churches. After some hesitation, a few bishops finally came for a meeting which proved surprisingly productive. So useful were the results of that first gathering, that it was decided to hold similar meetings every two years, and the Athens Consultation, a far larger and more important assembly, was planned.

The Consultation in Athens met, then, to discuss better ways of co-operation between the Y.M.C.A. and the Orthodox Churches in the Balkan countries, basing its deliberations on the rich experiences of the past eight years. And the past nineteen centuries, for one chief element in the discussions was how work done might be true to the best of the magnificent tradition of the ancient Church. Here were modernity and age, the practical West and the devotional East spending time together to discover how best they together could serve the youth of to-day.

Some of the conclusions reached are nothing short of surprising. Students have always been keen to point out the vast differences between the Christianity of the East and that of the West. In Athens the group discovered that those differences were not so extensive as they had thought. In the first place, it was learned, the moral and religious problems of youth in our modern age are very much the same, whether that youth is American or Bulgarian, German or Greek. To use the classic phrase of Bishop Nikolai, it is a struggle for the loyalty of youth between the tent-maker and the gods; between St. Paul and the pagan culture his work in Athens helped to overthrow. Youth to-day all over the world is facing the question: self or service—satisfaction in *things* or in the Christian ideal? East met West in deep concern for the youth who should be in the Church and found that, all the world around, they faced the same problems.

Another point of agreement was this: youth everywhere does not respond well to the Church's appeal. Discussion at Athens brought out the belief that this was due to out-of-date methods in the Church's approach. Said one bishop: "Life is life, not a monastery, not a parochial school. Life is changing. Somehow we must find a balance between the Church and the Christian life on one side, and changing modern life on the other." "Our Church is still using old approaches; it must change, not its truth, but its vocabulary to

meet the needs of the present day," this Council in Athens decided. It sounds very much like a quotation from *Middletown* or the *Christian Century*. Are West and East so different after all ?

And for the problems common to both East and West, at least one solution was found valid for the East which has proved useful in the West : an organization of laymen, loyal members of the Church, working in harmony with it, seeking humbly to serve it, but yet independent of Church authority. " Once the school, the family and the Church were sufficient," to quote one Orthodox speaker. " Now we need a new organization, one in which youth itself may be active, may help manage its own affairs." There is only one such laymen's organization which fits these specifications. The work of the Y.M.C.A. was declared to be as much needed in Eastern Church countries as in the West.

Once this was postulated, there remained the question of method. How could the programme of an association developed largely in an atmosphere entirely Protestant attain the desired results in the different *milieu* of Orthodoxy ? The " findings " of the consultation, unanimously adopted as the conviction of those present, represent some answers to this question.

Article 4 of the " Findings " is typical of the conclusions just mentioned.

> " The Y.M.C.A. should foster those ways and means which have been found to be most fruitful in deepening the religious interest of youth, in strengthening their faithfulness and attachment to the Church, and in having their lives dominated by the motive and spirit of Christian service. For example :
>
> " The encouragement of youth in the formation, under the spiritual guidance of the Church, of groups and brotherhoods for fellowship ; for the deepening of spiritual life ; for mutual encouragement especially when necessary in suffering for Christ ; and for giving expression to their religious convictions in service to others.
>
> " Apologetic activities such as lectures, discussions and the production and circulation of literature.
>
> " The formation of groups for the strengthening of Church consciousness by the study of the lives of the Holy Fathers and the Saints, of the Liturgy, of the Holy Scriptures and tradition, and also of Christianity as contrasted with other systems of thought and faith.
>
> " The organization and conduct of retreats, conferences, camps and pilgrimages to holy places, where young men and boys will be brought into intimate contact with Christian personalities whose lives and messages are calculated to make the most helpful and abiding spiritual impression."

At first glance this appears very little different from a typical Y.M.C.A. religious work programme in England or America. Fundamentally there is little difference: the aims are the same, and the basic methods. There is merely to be an adaptation to the psychology and spirit of the people concerned. For instance: instead of a Protestant Sunday service in a boys' camp the priest who lives in the camp with the boys conducts the liturgy, with perhaps a choir of the boys themselves to assist. Each day opens and closes with the beautiful prayers of the Orthodox Church. But do not get the idea that the entire time in such a boys' camp is spent in specifically religious meditation. The day's programme of games, handcraft, hikes or swimming goes on, just as though it were Britain instead of Bulgaria. And the priest, as likely as not himself a younger man, takes part with the boys in most of their occupations.

There is a charming photograph of one of the most successful among such camp chaplains, serving as "Admiral" in a naval battle between two fleets of rafts in the river, at one summer camp. At Athens we heard of the disapproval expressed by some pious lady, when a young priest, coming home from camp reported that he had participated in the children's games. "That is conduct unbecoming the cloth," the critic said. But the young man's discomfiture was quickly relieved by the smiling remark of his senior bishop, a stately man of seventy: "When I last visited England and watched my host, the Archbishop, playing an excellent game of tennis, I was sorry I could not join him." The thought of His Grace, in wide black robes which touched the ground and high cap and veil, on the tennis court brought a smile which at once disarmed criticism and sanctioned the almost revolutionary action of the young cleric.

Not long ago a wise Church historian wrote that the Eastern Church was "petrified by long inactivity. She is as stiff and lifeless as the postures of her Byzantine saints." If he could observe the new life in these old Churches to-day, he would be forced to another opinion. Here are boys' and girls' camps, Boy Scout troops, young people's clubs, with athletics and social service a part of their programme. All with not merely the approval, but with the full collaboration of the Church. It may be revolutionary, but it is being done, and producing the desired results. Young people are living better lives, in better relationship with the Church of their fathers.

Considering the utter novelty of the problems faced (for what are a dozen years since the War compared with nearly twenty centuries?), the unanimity of opinion and constructive results of the Consultation are remarkable. This still more so, when it is realized that all these opinions and the deliberations about them had to be conducted in five languages. Most of those present understood one of three, French, English or German, but for a few, special inter-

pretation was needed, into Russian or Greek. A brief statement by the Chairman, for example, in his native American was immediately transferred by interpreters to four groups in different corners of the assembly-room, each giving the remarks just made in the language best understood by their special group, be it French, German, Russian or Greek. In meetings of the League of Nations, three languages are usually used: this gathering went the League two better.

There were diversities of opinion, as well as of tongues. While all agreed upon the desirability of a training school for Orthodox youth leaders, there were many suggestions as to the best place in which to organize it. They varied from Paris, at one extreme, to Mount Athos, at the other. As will be noted, the differences between Paris and Mount Athos are not merely geographical. The French capital was suggested, it should be explained, because that city shelters the Russian Theological academy, which, it was thought, might adapt special courses for training leaders.

The Consultation closed with a prayer service conducted by the Archbishop of Athens. The importance of the whole Conference is difficult to overestimate. It represents a new stage in the increasingly fruitful relationships between Eastern and Western Christianity, new achievements in the interchange of useful experience. Again and again throughout the proceedings, speakers from the West referred to the values in Orthodoxy which they, personally, and Western Christianity in general had received from new contacts with the spiritual treasures the Eastern Church has guarded so faithfully. And Christian work for the youth of Orthodox lands will progress ever more effectively in the immediate future than in the past few years, because of the work of this gathering. Not only the organizations represented, but all those interested in strengthening the bonds of friendship and co-operation among the Christian Churches of the world, may feel gratified at the results of the Athens Consultation.

MISSIONARY WORK OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH

By the Revd. N. Behr.

AFTER the citizens of Kiev were baptized in 988, Christianity began to spread throughout Russia, in the first instance all round Kiev and up the great water-way from Kiev to Novgorod. The further away from Kiev the less hold it had on the people. In many places such as Novgorod paganism was stronger than Christianity. After Vladimir's death, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries the Christian religion gradually penetrated to places where it had been unknown or but little known before. Its

progress was greatly furthered by the division of Russia into separate princedoms, because each prince strove to spread Christianity in his appanage. Each of the chief towns became a centre of Christianity whereas before Kiev was the only such centre for the whole of Russia. Non-Russian tribes that lived in Russia and on its borders received Christian instruction from the Russians. By great Divine favour Russia had been christianized by the Greek Orthodox Church which always treated with respect the principles and sentiments of its converts. The Greeks spread Christianity by preaching it and convincing people of its truth and they did so in the native tongue of the Slavs. The Orthodox mission to the Slavs in other countries than Russia had already prepared a Slavonic translation of the Bible and of the church services and had trained Slav priests and teachers. The Metropolitan See of Moscow under the patronage of the State showed remarkable activities. The holy faith spread in the north by the White Sea and the centre of it there was the Solovetzky monastery. At the end of the sixteenth century with the conquest of Siberia, Christianity found its way into that vast tract of country. Another wide field for missionary activity was provided by the Kazan district and the nearer Caucasus where Russia always defended the Orthodox against Persia and upheld the Georgian Church.

After Peter the Great, the work of Orthodox missions went on as usual, continuing even at periods when under the influence of Western philosophy the State gave way to the spirit of the times and became practically indifferent to questions of religion. The work of christianizing Siberia was carried on by separate individuals. Particularly renowned in this respect are Bishop Innokenty and the learned Archimandrite Macary Gluharev, who was a deeply religious man, wholeheartedly devoted to missionary work. His field of activity was the Altai, a district peopled by Tartars, Kalmucs and Aleuts. Macary went there in 1830 and journeyed unwearyingly all over the district preaching Christ. A kind and tender-hearted man, he was teacher, father, doctor and general benefactor to his spiritual children. After 14 years he retired on account of his health, but his mission remained a splendid example to others. Missionary work in the Russian east was conducted amid the serious difficulties of a cold climate, the absence of roads, a wild country and often a hostile heathen population. Bishop Innokenty's activities extended over an enormous tract of country, which included the Kamchatka, Yakutsk and Amur districts and in some years, *e.g.*, in 1856, his journeys covered as much as 6,000 miles.

In the nineteenth century the missionary work of the Orthodox Church extended beyond the Russian Empire to China, America and Japan. In 1865 all the Russian missions were united in the missionary society founded in Petersburg; it proved useful to them

in the material sense as well, and owing to the subsidies given by that society the work of the missions grew more extensive and energetic.

Sixty-eight years ago, a monk who was also a priest, set out to the land of the Rising Sun along the great Siberian tract, by road as everyone did in those days; it was the future Bishop Nicolas (as a layman called Ivan Kasatkin), the great apostle of Japan. He had to spend the winter at Nicolaevsk, and there a touching meeting took place between two great missionaries, one who had already laid down the burden of apostolic work and the other who had only just assumed it—Bishop Innokenty and the priest monk, Nicolas, the first head of the Orthodox mission in Japan. Like the prophet Elijah who passed on both his mantle and the double portion of his spirit to Elisha, Bishop Innokenty cut out with his own hands a cassock for Father Nicolas and put his bronze cross round his neck. On July 2nd, 1861, Father Nicolas entered Hakodate on the Island of Yeddo, among a strange Eastern people whose language is hard for a European. The son of the Russian Consul used to take lessons in fencing from a certain Savabe, a Buddhist priest who despised and hated all foreigners. And it was precisely this man whom God had chosen, like another Saul, to be a second Paul for Japan. He gave up his profession, was baptized and received the name of Paul. Soon like St. Andrew he brought his friend, a physician called Sakai, who was also baptized and received the name of John. Now our sower of the Lord's field was no longer alone; there were already two and three gathered together in the name of Him who had promised to be among them. This was how, with God's blessing, the Orthodox faith began to be preached in Japan. On September 14th, 1864, Father Nicolas wrote from Hakodate to Isidore the Metropolitan of Petersburg, "At present one of the priests of the ancient religion comes to me to study our faith. If he does not cool down or perish (death is the penalty for accepting Christianity), a great deal may be expected from him. He has already made his plans for preaching the Christian religion although he has not as yet heard much about our Saviour, for we have only got as far as David in the Scriptures. I am expecting soon to receive from Peking the Bible and the church service books in the Chinese language, and perhaps two or three learned men will soon arrive from Yeddo and with their help my pupil will begin translating the sacred books from Chinese into Japanese." The priest referred to was Savabe. In April, 1865, Father Nicolas wrote to the Metropolitan, "The priest who wanted me secretly to instruct him in the Christian faith is almost ready for baptism. I have told him the Old Testament stories and at first he wrote down briefly at home what he had heard from me, but afterwards he began to take down my words in writing as I spoke them and in this way we have translated with

a few cuts the Old Testament history as told by Father Bogoslovsky; after a few corrections and additions have been made this translation can be published. Meanwhile I have received from the head of the Peking mission, the Archimandrite Guri, the New Testament and a few other books in Chinese. Instead of New Testament stories we read through the Gospel and as we went along I explained to the new convert almost the whole doctrine of our Church. He is eagerly waiting to be baptized, and I have great hopes of him: he is thirty-two years old, of irreproachable character, well educated, eloquent, intelligent and wholeheartedly devoted to Christianity. His one aim in life now is to serve his country by spreading the Christian faith. I have constantly to check his efforts in this direction for fear he loses his head before he has had time to do anything for the cause. Besides, the best educated and most idealistic of the young men of Hakodate centre round this priest so that through him I can get into touch with his chosen friends, one of whom is already studying Christianity, and two others show a desire to do so. My further plans are as follows: two of my friends have soon to go to Yeddo on business; through them I hope to find several educated and clever men interested in Christianity, and there are many such in Japan, and to replace by them the servants in my house so that at home at any rate, we may freely discuss Christianity. Meanwhile I shall obtain from Russia a lithographic press and thus if God gives me His blessing I will gradually prepare Christian books and preachers of the Christian faith. . . ."

In 1870 Orthodox missions were officially opened in Japan.

Bishop Nicolas was a living example of missionary devotion. He gave all his income to the Church, thus making up the deficit on the support of schools, publications and preachers; he never refused money to poor Christians, though it was at the cost of depriving himself of the elementary comforts of life. His work has not been wasted. A small Christian flock was formed round him and his example shows that the Orthodox church, not seeking worldly dominion and free from national hostility, embraces in its love all tribes and peoples.

The apostle of Japan died in 1912. The Japanese Orthodox church is now headed by Archbishop Sergius.

A beautiful cathedral has been built in Tokio, a clerical seminary, a girls' school, missionary headquarters and printing offices have been founded—a regular little town from which the light of Christian faith has poured all over Japan. The earthquake of September 19th, 1923, did a great deal of damage to the mission. Tokio cathedral was destroyed. Money is being collected for the rebuilding of it and we hope with God's help to raise the necessary sum. In 1924, a church dedicated to St. Nicolas was consecrated

which accommodates 450 people. In 1924-25, 429 people were baptized. In 1925-26, 580.

I want to lay emphasis in the first place upon the all-embracing character of Orthodoxy, both in its temporal aspect and in its attitude to life and to the outside world. Modern Orthodoxy is the heritage of bygone ages and its spirit is that of the centuries-old Catholic church. It forms one whole with the great spiritual past; the inner life of Orthodoxy is nurtured by the fathers of the church and is a part of the living stream that flows from the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is not a lifeless relic of antiquity, but something essentially living. The tradition of the church is not a mechanically formed deposit, but a living spirit. It means throwing one's self wholly into a rich, fresh and vigorous life, and not merely preserving the ossified remains of the past.

The Orthodox mind looks hopefully into the future. The light of the church triumphant draws the Orthodox soul to itself and sustains in it the holy flame that animates the church.

The church triumphant calls the church militant to struggle against evil on earth. The aim of Orthodoxy is union with God. To seek Him, to surrender to Him utterly our heart and mind, will, soul and body, such is the message of Orthodoxy. It cannot be content with less, and mere morality is not enough for it. Orthodoxy does not give rise to spiritual aristocracy; being a sacramental religion, it cannot engender a feeling of pride in one's superiority to other people. The one and only aim worthy of man is holiness, the way to God is to be found through our own personal experience and we must seek it always.

In its external aspect Orthodoxy is concerned with the world as a whole, it seeks to bring the spirit of the church into all spheres of life all over the world. Its mission is œcumenical. The whole physical world must be redeemed and transfigured through the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Orthodox church contains a synthesis of truth and love. It eagerly seeks for a communion in Christ with the non-Orthodox and gladly offers the best gifts from its treasure house of thought and piety to its brethren outside its pale.

THE STORY OF THE RED WAR UPON RELIGION.

By Canon Douglas.

(Reprinted from *The Morning Post.*)

IF the body of Bolshevism is Communism, its soul is Atheism—not an easy going, intellectual Atheism which despises Religion as a dying delusion but a savage dogmatic Atheism, which regards it as the supreme enemy, hates it and is set on exterminating it.

Bolshevism is a fanaticism, a Religion of Irreligion.

It proclaims a new world which is to be no less a godless world from which Religion, with every vestige of its ethics and morals, will have been obliterated, no less than a communist world from which Capitalism, with every vestige of private property and enterprise will have been extirpated.

The Bolshevik war upon Religion is inseparable from its war upon Individualism and has always been masked by political excuse.

The history of its double-fronted offensive may best be sketched in its four phases of

i. The establishment of the stranglehold in Russia. 1917—20.
ii. The destruction of Religious Organization. 1920—23.
iii. The period of *reculer pour mieux sauter.* 1923—28.
iv. The present general attack which is planned to make Russia both godless and communist by 1933.

To-day the Bolsheviks do not claim to be more than one in thirty of the 120,000,000 of Russia. In 1917 they numbered no more than 50,000. The story of how that insignificant percentage established a stranglehold on the Russian nation is like a lurid romance.

In the summer of 1917, Russia was falling into chaos. Three years of crushing defeat after defeat had destroyed the Nation's will to victory. The Tsar Nicholas had abdicated in the Spring and the Tsardom had disappeared. The *intelligentsia* Republic set up by Kerensky was hopelessly doctrinaire and ineffective. The Army was disbanding itself and could hardly maintain its front. Government was ceasing throughout the country. To knock Russia out of the War was a chief object of the German High Command. It could not send troops to do so. But smash the head and the body is powerless. The 50,000 Bolsheviks were the only force with a mind of its own in Russia and were organized as a machine of mechanical efficiency, which was controlled absolutely from Switzerland by Lenin and his half dozen *confrères* of the Politik bureau who held the strings of it. The Kaiser packed them in a sealed train, smuggled them across Germany and sent them into Russia to complete its chaos with a Red Revolution.

Their leaders' arrival was followed by the Bolsheviks' seizure of

Petrograd and Moscow and the Red Republic was proclaimed in October, 1917.

If the Bolsheviks' hold-up of the capital cities was developed into a stranglehold in all Russia, it was because Lenin who combined a great gambler's daring with a preternatural flair of common sense, was their master mind and had their implicit obedience.

The policy which he laid down was that of eating the artichoke leaf by leaf.

In effect the Russian Nation was an inchoate herd of docile peasants whose great hunger was to own the land they tilled and whose whole life was dominated by the traditions of their religion. Lenin had to give them a stake in the Red Republic or it was bound to disappear. It was true that he had returned to make Russia godless and communist and not a land of religious peasant proprietors. But that must wait. The Russian Armies had broken up and the peasants were streaming home and were his danger. By telling them to take the land and sending men to kill off the landowners, he became their avatar, blinded them to what Bolshevism was and meant to do and made them its mercenaries so long as it needed them.

The peasants being on his side, Lenin was able to get together a Red Army strong enough to beat down every attempt at a counter revolution, to defeat the White Armies and bit by bit to extend his dictatorship over all Russia.

Meanwhile, he was busy perfecting the Bolshevik machine and preparing the ground for the war upon Religion and all Individualism.

The Red Revolution could not have been bloodless. Lenin made it as bloody as he dared. The strategy which he laid down and to which his followers have been faithful might have been drawn from the parable which Tarquin acted by cutting down the tallest poppies. Its first principle is to get rid of every possible leader of opposition, active or passive, to godlessness and communism. The hideous details of the Red Terror which at Lenin's bidding reigned in the pandemonium of Russia from 1917-19 can never be described. It went on pitilessly and openly until Lenin had need of trade with the rest of the world. Then it became camouflaged and more restrained. The number of its victims was limited only by expediency and will never be known. When it was over the landowning classes had been practically exterminated and what was left of the *intelligentsia* and the trading classes was a mere remnant. As for the leaders of Religion, Lenin was as wise as the Red Sultan Abd-ul-Hamed who knew to a nicety how many Armenians he could massacre with impunity. He had won the peasantry and dare not risk losing them by killing off their clergy.

Of the 21 bishops who are admitted to have been got rid of, at

least five were killed with unmitigated barbarity. Priests and monks were picked off in their thousands.

To talk of Red Russia is nonsense. The Russian people to-day is like a man who in a fantastic novel is lashed to a table while an inhuman scientist cuts and carves at his brain and organs in order to change his nature and their functions.

The vivisector is the Bolshevik Politik bureau and the instruments both of his stranglehold and his experiment are the Bolshevik Party.

The inevitableness of that simile is obvious once it is realized that the whole Soviet régime is simply a constitutional camouflage of the Bolshevik machine.

Soviet means council. From the central Moscow Soviet downwards to the village council, every Soviet official and every Soviet elector must be on the registers of the Bolshevik Party. To get and remain on those registers, a man must convince the officials who control them both of his fanaticism for atheism and communism and of his automatic obedience to their orders. Up to the highest of them, those officials are the creatures of the occult half-dozen members of the Party's Politik bureau, the wink of an eye from which in Moscow is sufficient to set the machine going in the remotest village. A universal system of espionage, the last word in efficiency, keeps the fanaticism of the whole machine red hot.

Since no cannier man than Lenin has lived, the form of the second phase of the Persecution was probably not according to Lenin's plan. But in any case, he got where he wished.

The Red Terror had left individualism broken and out in the towns. But the peasants are Russian and to turn them into atheist and communist *robots* was his essential problem. They also were his stranglehold. But though oxen are easily herded into an abattoir, a red light will stampede them furiously. Before the taking of the land and their religion from them was proclaimed, potential leaders had to be weeded out of every village and the machinery of their Church which still held together, smashed. If there was no uprising, they could neither be made to work nor stop praying.

But a dictator must study his Prætorian Guards. The Bolshevik Party had only been fleshed by the Red Terror and was clamant to finish the job. In all likelihood, Lenin was reluctant but in 1920 he decreed the partial collectivization of the farms. The appalling famine of 1921-2 followed and to get the peasants together again, he announced a New Economic Policy of petty private ownership and in compensation let his fanatics strike at religion.

In Asiatic Russia, there were some millions of Moslems and other non-Christians. In the West there were a million or so Roman Catholics who were almost all Poles and in the towns a percentage of Protestants.

The Church of the peasants, as almost cent. per cent. of the whole Russian race, is the ancient Russian Orthodox Church.

Many of its bishops had been executed. Others were in prison. Its machinery was paralysed. But it still functioned and adhered in the Patriarch Tikhon. Lenin determined to hasten its disintegration.

The decision by which the Patriach Tikhon had been called to be the first Patriarch that Russia had had for 200 years had been by lot. Among the three names in the urn had been that of the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev, who now presides over the Synod of the Russian Exiles in Serbia and the printing of whose letter to our bishops in the *Morning Post* has done much to open the eyes of England to what is happening in Russia. The Patriarchal Election took place in the Kremlin on November 5th, 1917, while Lenin's machine-guns were still firing on Moscow and when the one man who could have rallied Orthodox Russia against him was its new Patriarch. The Metropolitan Anthony is a great theologian, but he is also a man of action, and understood the Bolshevik mind. If his name had been drawn from the urn, the history of Russia would in any case have been different. But the Patriarch Tikhon was a saint and abhorred politics. In due course, he showed himself a great confessor, but in 1917 and to his death he held it his duty to submit to the Red Republic.

None the less, Lenin decided in 1922 to try him publicly and shoot him as a counter revolutionary. His preparations took a long time and were skilful. The reforming party, the so-called Living Church, was fostered. The Patriarch was immured in a Monastery. During the famine he had refused to bid his clergy hand over the Church vessels and so on. Though the Bolsheviks did not sell the Tsar's jewels which have since fetched more than £1,000,000, they seized and sold the ecclesiastical "treasures" for less than £50,000. Russia was deluged with the statement that he was to be tried for letting the people starve. The Living Church leaders called a pseudo-Council and deposed him. And so on.

In December, 1922, the Patriarch's trial was notified to the world as fixed for the next April.

It is wiser in Russia not to whisper news which is not published by the Red censorship. Thus the monstrous execution in July 1922 of its beloved Bishop Benjamin of Petrograd was unconfirmed outside Russia for months.

The advance publicity given to the Patriarch's execution saved the Patriarch and killed Lenin. He could crush away trouble brewing in Russia but their necessary trade made him unready for the indignant protests which poured in upon him from Europe and America. Their trade was necessary. The condemnation of the Polish Roman Catholic Archbishop Cieplak and Mgr. Budkiewicz

as a *ballon d'essai* on Palm Sunday, changed the protests into angry warnings. Lenin reprieved the Archbishop and shot Mgr. Budkiewicz on March 31 and lashed the civilized world into a frenzy of indignation. The next night he was stricken with complete paralysis.

With its dictator a dying log, the Politik bureau had no nerve to go on, and the Patriarch was released.

The Persecution's third phase of Comparative Quiescence lasted until the Georgian soldier Stalin became master of the Bolshevik machine.

By the will of the Patriarch who died in April, 1925, the Metropolitan Peter became Patriarchal locum tenens and was promptly sent to Siberia where he now lies dying in prison. The Metropolitan Sergius whom he ordered to take over the post of danger, is a strong and courageous man, but he is not Patriarch and the machinery of the Church is almost wholly disintegrated. Undoubtedly it was because his people are hostages, that he denied the existence of any persecution in Russia the other day.

Whether he is the fanatic he is reputed or not, Stalin has not Lenin's magic as the Moses of Bolshevism. Lenin could curb his fanatics by asking if they wished to wander again in Switzerland. Stalin had to clear the Politik bureau of rivalry before he was secure in the Bolshevik dictatorship and he did that by outbidding them in fanaticism.

Constitutions as stringently anti-clerical as that of the Red Republic have existed before on paper.

The Bolshevik method all along has been to reach its godless objective by throttling Religion.

Of course, from the beginning, every child in every school has been instructed in godlessness and its abominable sex hygiene. The orgies of its hideous and disgusting Komsomol processions which travesty every religion, demonstrate the triumph of godlessness. The Press, the wireless, the lecture hall are the channels of its godless propaganda.

But all along its method has been to throttle religion piecemeal by punishing it as a "counter revolutionary" activity. Its constitution still professes to leave it free. It secularized all church property, the clergy were left as pariahs, charitable organizations were forbidden, the religious teaching of children under 18 was made a crime and so on. But it left the churches open and their congregations undissolved.

"Counter revolutionary" activity is an elastic term. In the past twelve years it has been stretched to cover all corporate religious life. To defend religion publicly is to propagate it and is a "counter revolutionary" activity. It is the same with making a

convert, holding a children's service, or a mothers' meeting and giving money to a church fund for the sick or dying.

The Russian is a lover of the Bible. Religious books are instruments of counter revolutionary activity. To distribute the Bible or the Koran is forbidden.

It was by declaring that he would finally round up Religion in Russia by 1933 that Stalin made himself the dictator of Bolshevism in 1928 and opened the fourth phase of the Persecution. If he carries it through, to confess any religion and to say a prayer will soon be a "counter revolutionary" activity.

Meanwhile, progress is being made. Those who are worth while removing, are charged with counter revolutionary activity and disappear. Religious life is becoming impossible in Russia.

FORBIDDEN BELLS.

Can you imagine Russia dumb?
Enforced with silence, awed and numb.
For soon a myriad listening ears
Will wait the message Easter bears,
The air awaits the accustomed cry
To fling the echo to the sky,
"Christ is risen, is risen indeed."
Which now the people must not heed.

The inheritance once proudly borne
Now voiceless villages will mourn,
Only the Spring feels not the loss
And birch trees newly foliaged toss
Their tremulous leaflets to the clouds,
And streams are freed from icy shrouds;
But who is there to care or heed
The ghostly "Christ is risen indeed"?
Who heard the resonance of bells,
The beautiful and solemn bells,
The eager, clamorous, joyous bells,
The light, persistent, childish bells,
Voices that rang the faith, the tears,
The fervent thoughts and whispered prayers.

Like fields snow-covered, still and numb,
Are bells forbidden, stricken dumb.

V. St. George, 1930.

A. & E.C.A. NOTES.

ST. CLEMENT'S League of Prayer for Russia seems to have supplied a need of which many people were conscious, *i.e.*, of organized and regular intercession for the persecuted Russian Church. The League was founded on February 14th, and its membership is now over 2,600. It is in no permanent sense "a new society" and no subscription is asked for. Each member simply undertakes to say a given collect, or the Our Father, for Russia, every day for twelve months from the date of enrolling his name. Thus no one is bound for more than one year, yet so long as new members join, the League itself will continue until its existence is no longer needed. A copy of the leaflet is enclosed with this issue of *The Christian East* and more may be obtained for distribution from the address printed on them. During his recent visit to London, the Metropolitan Evlogie was present at one of the Tuesday Masses of Intercession for Russia, gave his blessing to the League, and addressed those members of it who were present. At the same time a large silver Russian cross (a gift of Mr. C. F. L. St. George) mounted as an altar cross was blessed for use whenever the special intention of the service is for Russia.

* * * *

A. and E.C.A. issued a short form of Intercession for the Persecuted Church of Russia, for use on the Day of General Intercession, and at other times. It has the sanction of many diocesan bishops and it was widely used on March 16th. By arrangement also, the prayers which have long been familiar to members of the Association were incorporated in the form of service issued by S.P.C.K. On March 19th at the kind invitation of Preb. Mackay, the Association made the High Mass at All Saints', Margaret Street, their corporate act of intercession for Russia, and the General Secretary preached the sermon. There was a large congregation and the collection was given to the Russian Church Aid Fund. A like kindness extended by Fr. Lester Pinchard on April 2nd enabled the Association to offer a Solemn Requiem at St. John's, Holland Road, for the Russian Christians who have perished through persecution and massacre.

* * * *

On March 26th, Lord Aldenham gave an "At Home" for the Association at his house in Portland Place. Between 70 and 80 guests accepted the invitation. Archbishop Lord Davidson was to have presided, but unfortunately he was prevented by indisposition from fulfilling the engagement. His place was taken by Lord Aldenham, and the Bishop of London was present for a short while at the beginning of the meeting. The Metropolitan Germanos spoke in warm commendation of the aims and ideals of the Association

and Sir Bernard Pares gave a masterly account of the meaning of the Russian persecution and the phases of its development.

* * * *

As announced in our last issue a Marble Arch branch of the Association has come into being. By the courtesy of the Vicar, Fr. Waddington, its members were allowed to combine their quarterly service with the Patronal Evensong of the Church of Annunciation, Bryanston Street on March 25th. The Metropolitan Germanos and Fr. Behr were present, the former being welcomed at the West door by choir and clergy with εἰς πολλα ἐτη δεσποτα. The service was beautifully sung, and the Metropolitan Germanos preached to the people.

* * * *

Nine churches took part in the A. and E.C.A. Sunday at Bournemouth this year, and sermons on some aspect of the work of the Association were preached at all of them. As usual a public meeting was held on the next day, and that also was more fully attended than ever before. Fr. Caswall, Chairman of the Bournemouth Branch presided, and speeches were made by Fr. Gage-Brown, Fr. Napier Whittingham, Fr. Borough and the General Secretary.

One very satisfactory outcome of this Meeting was that the Bournemouth Branch of A. and E.C.A. undertook the support of one of the students now training for the priesthood at the Russian Academy in Paris, and is now setting to work to raise £50 a year for that purpose. A day or two after the meeting the General Secretary received a letter from one who was present but wishes to remain anonymous, enclosing a cheque for £45 also to maintain a student for one year at the Academy. Both these generous contributions to this splendid object will be applied through the Bursaries Scheme of the Russian Church Aid Fund: and the A. and E.C.A. has the honour of providing the first two Bursaries to be actually realized under that scheme.

* * * *

Mr. E. O. Leggatt has presented a copy of Neale's *Primitive Liturgies* and the companion volume of *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies* by Neale and Littledale to the Association Library. We have also to thank the Revd. C. B. Moss for Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (4 vols.) and *The Patriarchate of Antioch*. Neale's *History* is difficult to obtain nowadays. Members of the Association are reminded that they are entitled to borrow books from the Library at a nominal charge—1d. a week per volume, and postage both ways.

* * * *

A CORRECTION.

On page 139, line 35 of our last issue, for "than" please read "but."

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

Hon. Secretary: The VISCOUNT HALIFAX.
Secretary: The EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, K.P.

THE UNION OF CLERGY AND LAITY was founded in 1859. Its Objects are: (1) To defend and maintain unimpaired the Doctrine, Discipline, and position of the Church of England as an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ; (2) To promote unity and mutual help and the due consultation of Secretary in all branches of Missionary and other; and in those departments of philanthropic organizations and mutual industry, which are closely related to religion; (3) To afford counsel, guidance, and sympathy, on all matters, lay or clerical, which may under ancient constitution of Missionary, be submitted to it; and (4) in general to the promoting the interests of Religion as in us, by God's help, a united witness for the advancement of His glory and the good of His Church.

Clergy and laity of the Church of England should apply to the Secretary for terms and conditions of membership.

Subscription

Diocesan Subscription, 10s. per annum; Associate Subscription, 5s. 6d. per annum.

Every Catholic Priest or Lay person should belong to the Union. It does and accepts both, and is ready to work with other Churches and all Christians ready to the best of its power.

The Union is prepared to take any measure and practicable of the present and of the immediate future. It is organized on a Diocesan basis in order to deal with practical needs in each diocese with efficiency, and to organize the Catholic vote to discover elections for the Convocation and the Church Assembly.

Consolidation of forces and co-operation are the most urgent needs of Catholics to-day: for this and Membership in the Union presents the most favourable opportunity and the best means.

St. Bride's Square, W.C.1. ARNOLD PINCHARD, Secretary.

Read THE CHURCH UNION GAZETTE (The Organ of the Union)
Post Free, 1/6 per annum.

BLIND

The London Society for Teaching and Training the Blind.

SWISS COTTAGE, LONDON, N.W.3.

Patron: Their Most Gracious Majesties THE KING AND QUEEN.

Since 1838 the Society has educated, technically trained and found employment for blind persons from all parts of the British Isles. To-day it has over 300 sightless men, women, and children in its care. Do you know of a more worthy cause than that the blind boy and girl should be trained to earn a living? Donations and Legacies are urgently needed.

J. M. RITCHIE, M.A., Ph.D., Superintendent & Secretary,
SCHOOL for the BLIND, Swiss Cottage, LONDON.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED.

Σφενδόνη. The Phanar, Constantinople.
Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος. Athens.
Orientalia Christiana. Rome.
Ἐκκλησία. The Patriarchate, Alexandria.
Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν Φάρος. The Patriarchate, Alexandria.
Νέα Σιών. The Patriarchate, Jerusalem.
Ἐκκλησία. Holy Synod of the Church, Athens.
Церковныя Ведомости. The Russian Synod, Karlowicz.
Гласник. 4, Highbridge, Belgrad, Serbia.
Ὁ Τύπος Ἐκκλησ. Odos Hadrian 6, Athens.
Църковен Вестник. Sophia, Bulgaria.
Известия Православ. Палестина. Jerusalem.
The Living Church. Milwaukee, U.S.A.
The Islamic Review. The Mosque, Woking.
L'Europe Orientale. Via Machiavelli 84, Rome.
The Antidote. New York.
The Harvard Theological Review. Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Irénikon. Prieuré d'Amay, Belgium.
Ἑλληνικὰ. Athens.

☞ NOTICE.—All communications, enquiries and subscriptions should be sent to the Rev. P. M. Dearmer, 66, Holland Road, W.14

Eastern Church Books.

THE CHURCHES OF EASTERN ORTHODOXDOM. From A.D. 451 to the present time. By the Rev. B. J. Kidd, D.D., Warden of Keble College Oxford. Demy 8vo. 552 pp. 12 photographs. Cloth 10s.

PROPHETS, PRIESTS, AND PATRIARCHS. Sketches of the Races of Palestine and Syria. By Harry Charles Luke, C.M.G., B.Litt., M.A. Demy 8vo. 244 pp. with coloured frontispiece. 16 Illus. and maps. Cloth 6s.

THE RELATIONS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. 404 pp. Price 10s. Popular edition, 3/6.

A DICTIONARY OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Dr. F. H. Lancford-James. Price 7/6.

WHO'S WHO IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By Rev. W.C. Piercy. 7s. 6d.

LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF RUSSIAN CHURCH HISTORY. By Dr. W. H. Frere, Bishop of Truro. Price 7/6. Popular edition, 3/6.

THE REDEMPTION OF ST. SOPHIA. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. Introduction by Bishop Gore. Fourth Edition. Price 2s. 6d.

THE CHURCH AND FAITH OF ARMENIA. By Dr. Aziz Asharabian, Armenian Vartaped in London. Price 2s. 6d. paper.

ARMENIAN CHURCH CUSTOMS AND THE DIFFERENCE OF RITE SERVICE. By Lady Surma d'Bait Kas Sarkies. Price 2s. 6d. paper.

THE BAGHDAD REFORMED CHURCH. By Brigadier-General E. S. Adams. Paper, 2s. 6d.

THE SPIRITUAL HERITAGE OF RUSSIA. By Bishop Nicholai Velimirovic. 2s. 6d. paper.

CHRISTIAN SERBIA. By Commander Lyon. 2s. 6d. paper.

PICTURES OF RUSSIAN CHURCHES. By Rev. J. A. Douglas, 2s. 6d.

PRAYER BOOK IN ARMENIA AND ARMENIAN. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. 2s.

THE SYRIAN AND ARMENIAN CHURCHES. By Leslie Stephen. 2s.

RUSSIA'S CHURCH WITH THE Apostolic Succession. By the Rev. D. W. A. Wigram. 2s.

THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM. Translated by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, M.A., from the Greek Liturgies of the Eastern. 4s. 6d.

THE DEPARTURE OF THE HIERUSALEM. By the Rev. D. W. A. Wigram. 2s. 6d.

THE ALL-HOLY VIRGIN OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. Compiled and edited by the Rev. S. Tyszkiewicz, B.D., and V. Tyszkiewicz. 2s.

FAITH PRESS, Ltd., 27, Buckingham St., Charing Cross, W.C.2.

MADE IN GREAT BRITAIN